DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 067 TM 000 865

AUTHOR	Freeberg, Norman E.; Reilly, Richard R.
TITLE	Development of Guidance Measures for Youth-Work Training Program Enrollees Phase I: Measurement of Program Objectives and the Development of Criteria. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	PR-71-13
PUB DATE	Jul 71
NOTE	152p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Cluster Analysis; Disadvantaged Youth; Employee Attitudes; *Evaluation Criteria; Factor Analysis; Job Satisfaction; *Job Training; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Success Factors; Task Performance; Vocational Adjustment; *Work Experience Programs; *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS	*Neighborhood Youth Corps; Program Objectives

ABSTRACT

Rationally defined outcome variables, for use in evaluating youth-work training programs, were incorporated in questionnaires administered to present and former Neighborhood Youth Corp enrollees and analyzed to determine their suitability as criterion measures. Using a factor analytic technique, empirically defined clusters were obtained for immediately available outcomes and longer-term outcomes. The most logical groups of criteria were found for those former enrollees who had full-time employment experience. Relatively clear patterns of job-oriented capability and success were dominant as were two separate factors bearing on personal adjustment to the job and to the community. Some descriptive highlights concerning the vocational behaviors of former trainees are presented and future research needs for better definition and understanding of program objectives are discussed. For the six rating instruments used in the study, see TM 000 866-871. (Author/AG)

PR-71-13

DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE MEASURES FOR YOUTH-WORK TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLEES
PHASE I: MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA

Norman E. Freeberg
and
Richard R. Reilly

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

July 1971

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

ED056067

DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE MEASURES FOR YOUTH-WORK TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLEES

PHASE I: MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA

Norman E. Freeberg

and

Richard R. Reilly

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, N. J.

Final Report
U.S. Department of Labor Contract #41-9-005-32
July 1971

This report was prepared for the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under research and development Contract No. 41-9-005-32 authorized by the Economic Development Act. Since contractors performing such work under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, the report does not necessarily represent the Department's official opinion or policy. Moreover, the contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in the report.

STANDARD TITLE PAGE FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS	1. Report No. DLMA 41-9-005-32-1	2. Govt. Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.
4. Title and Subtitle DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE MEASURES FOR YOUTH-WORK TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLEES. PHASE I: MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA			5. Report Date July 1971 6. Performing Organization Code
7. Author(s) Norman E. Freeberg and Richard R. Reilly			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Educational Testing Service Rosedale Road Princeton, New Jersey 08540			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No. DL 41-9-005-32
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address **U.S. Department of Labor** **Manpower Administration** **Office of Research and Development** **1111 20th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20210**			13. Type of Report & Period Covered Final 14. Sponsoring Agency Code
15. Supplementary Notes			

16. Abstracts Rationally defined outcome variables, for use in evaluating youth-work training programs, were incorporated in questionnaires administered to present and former Neighborhood Youth Corp enrollees and analyzed to determine their suitability as criterion measures. Using a factor analytic technique, empirically defined clusters were obtained for immediately available (end-of-program) outcomes and longer-term (postprogram) outcomes. The most logical groups of criteria were found for those former enrollees who had full-time employment experience. Relatively clear patterns of job-oriented capability and success were dominant as were two separate factors bearing on personal adjustment to the job and to the community.

Some descriptive highlights concerning the vocational behaviors of former trainees are presented and future research needs for better definition and understanding of program objectives are discussed.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

Psychological Tests

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

Youth-work training programs

17c. COSATI Field/Group 5I

18. Distribution Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Distribution is unlimited. Available from National Technical Information Service, Springfield Va., 22151.	UNCLASSIFIED	147
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price $3.00 HC .95 M

FORM CFSTI-35 (4-70) USCOMM-DC 65002-P70

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM CFSTI-35(4-70) (Standard Title Page for Technical Reports based on COSATI Guidelines to Format Standards for Scientific and Technical Reports Prepared by or for the Federal Government, PB-180 600).

1. **Report Number.** Each report shall carry a unique alphanumeric designation consisting of the letters DLMA followed by the contract or grant number, e.g., DLMA-81-25-68-10. For each report produced under a contract or grant, add -1, -2, etc. after the contract or grant number, e.g., DLMA 81-25-68-10-1.
2. **Government Accession Number.** Leave blank.
3. **Recipient's Catalog Number.** Reserved for use by each report recipient.
4. **Title and Subtitle.** Title should indicate clearly and briefly the subject coverage of the report, and be displayed prominently. Set subtitle, if used, in smaller type or otherwise subordinate it to main title. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number and include subtitle for the specific volume.
5. **Report Date.** Please use the date of issue of final report, not the date of approval of the draft. Abbreviate month (limited to three letters) and year, e.g., Sep. 70.
6. **Performing Organization Code.** Leave blank.
7. **Author(s).** Give name(s) in conventional order (e.g., John R. Doe, or J.Robert Doe). List author's affiliation if it differs from the performing organization.
8. **Performing Organization Report Number.** Insert if performing organization wishes to assign this number.
9. **Performing Organization Name and Address.** Give name, street, city, state, and zip code. List no more than two levels of an organizational hierarchy. Display the name of the organization exactly as it should appear in Government indexes such as USGRDR-I.
10. **Project/Task/Work Unit Number.** Leave blank.
11. **Contract/Grant Number.** Insert Department of Labor contract or grant number, preceded by DL, e.g., DL 81-25-68-10.
12. **Sponsoring Agency Name and Address.** Already filled in.
13. **Type of Report and Period Covered.** Indicate interim, final, etc., and, if applicable, dates covered.
14. **Sponsoring Agency Code.** Leave blank.
15. **Supplementary Notes.** Enter information not included elsewhere but useful, such as: Prepared in cooperation with . . . Translation of . . . Presented at conference of . . . To be published in . . .
16. **Abstract.** Include a brief (200 words or less) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report. If the report contains a significant bibliography or literature survey, mention it here.
17. **Key Words and Document Analysis. (a). Descriptors.** Select only from attached Key Words-Descriptors, proper authorized terms that identify the major concept of the research and are sufficiently specific and precise to be used as index entries for cataloging.
    (b). Identifiers and Open-Ended Terms. Use identifiers for project names, code names, etc. If no descriptor exists, select terms from 1970 Manpower Research Projects index.
    (c). COSATI Field/Group Select from attached COSATI Subject Categories. Use only the code numbers, e.g., 5J, to indicate the field of Behavioral and Social Sciences and the appropriate group.
18. **Distribution Statement.** Cite any availability to the public with address and price.
19 & 20. **Security Classification.** Do not submit classified reports to the Clearinghouse.
21. **Number of Pages.** Insert the total number of pages, including this one and unnumbered pages, but excluding distribution list, if any.
22. **Price.** Insert price set by the National Technical Information Service ($3 for reports with 300 or fewer pages; $6 for those with 301-600 pages; $9 for those with 601-900 pages. The microfiche price for all reports in $.95.)

PREFATORY NOTE

In accordance with an intention to maintain the confidentiality of the information provided, all data retained on computer tape are identifiable for an individual respondent by code number only. Original questionnaire materials have been destroyed and there is no practical way of identifying an individual by name with his, or her, item responses.

DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE MEASURES FOR YOUTH-WORK TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLEES

PHASE I: MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA

Norman E. Freeberg

and

Richard R. Reilly

Educational Testing Service

Princeton, N. J.

Abstract

This study deals with methodological issues in the development of measured objectives for a youth-work training program, along with analyses that serve to illustrate how empirical data can be used to supplement rational choices of program outcomes. Correlational analyses of outcome measures were used to define the "structure" underlying a system of criteria from which the best sets of coherent scales, or composite measures, might be derived.

For end-of-training program (short-term) objectives, the dominant dimension found was defined as "Training Program Adjustment" consisting of ratings of enrollee performance in the program, combined with measures of social adjustment. Other distinct groupings of variables were definable as "Job Aspirations," "Social Adjustment," "Personal Image" and "Planning Competency."

Longer term (intermediate) objectives applicable to enrollee post-program performance--for those who had held full-time employment--produced

relatively clear patterns of job-oriented capabilities. Among these, a "General Job Success and Adjustment" pattern was dominant, with others definable as "Job Stability-Mobility," "Striving for Vocational Success" and "Blue Collar Job Success." Two personal adjustment dimensions accompanying those were designated as "Community and Family Adjustment" and "Vocational Adjustment-Dissatisfaction."

A set of four dimensions, obtained from the criterion variables applicable to a subgroup of former enrollees who had never held full-time employment, was found to be relatively unclear and difficult to define. The research implications and problems posed by attempts to measure degree of "success" for such a subgroup are considered.

Some descriptive highlights concerning vocational behaviors of former enrollees are presented and future research needs, essential to a more complete understanding of program objectives, are discussed.

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. Purpose	1
	B. Background	4
	C. Concepts of Criterion Development	7
II.	Method	22
	A. Selection of Criterion Variables	22
	B. Questionnaire Design and Administration	40
	C. Sample and Data Collection	42
	D. Data Analyses	50
III.	Results and Discussion	52
	A. Program Completion Criteria	53
	B. Post-Program Criteria (Enrollees with Full-Time Employment Experience)	61
	C. Post-Program Criteria (Enrollees with No Full-Time Employment Experience)	71
	D. "The" Employment Criterion	79
	E. Some Descriptive Highlights of the Post-Program Samples	81
IV.	Conclusions and Recommendations	84

DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDANCE MEASURES FOR YOUTH-WORK TRAINING PROGRAM ENROLLEES

PHASE I: MEASUREMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA

I. Introduction

A. Purpose

The ability to demonstrate the effectiveness of any social program is almost completely a function of the ability to measure intended goals, or objectives, with reasonable accuracy. It is the measurement "quality" of the variables chosen to define performance standards that ultimately makes it possible to: (a) specify the degree of program success, (b) feedback information for modifying and improving program components and (c) carry out meaningful research leading to increased understanding of the population served. Where the effort is made to identify and measure, properly, an array of agreed-upon outcome variables there are corresponding administrative advantages likely to accrue in the form of better control of program processes, the design of more effective programs and the establishing of accountability for those programs that have been undertaken.

For many governmentally-funded manpower training programs, aimed at effecting broad social change, statements of program intent have often been highly general and too rarely translated into applicable behavioral objectives--both long and short term--with defined measurement requirements. Even less attention has been paid to the availability and suitability of outcome variables that would be needed to measure intended goals with reasonable continuity from study-to-study, or program to program. Early

efforts to demonstrate training outcomes were primarily anecdotal (U.S. Senate, 1963) and heavily dependent on testimonials that can hardly serve as strong supporting evidence for clear specifications of goals. Relatively recent studies, conducted in the latter half of the 1960's, have tended to move toward more precisely defined outcomes (Levitan & Mangum, 1969). Unfortunately, they have neglected to provide a broad overview of possible measures for satisfying a variety of criterion needs or a stated rationale--logical or empirical--to justify the choice of specific variables. In addition, the studies have generally not gone beyond descriptive surveys of demographic data (e.g., numbers working or looking for work by age, sex, educational level, etc.) with simple tabulations of frequencies, or proportions, for the criterion variables chosen, so that rather weak evidence is available for selecting one particular set of outcome variables as more appropriate than others. Borus and Tash (1970) in their discussion of impact measurement for manpower training programs have leveled similar criticism at these study designs and the virtually exclusive use of univariate methods. Fortunately, there are more fruitful analytical approaches available in behavioral science that would seem to be essential if the hope is to construct a defensible system of measurable program objectives, able to encompass the complex performance variables that characterize the manpower training enterprise.

The present study represents an initial step in demonstrating how certain of those techniques might be applied to a systematic, comprehensive examination of a number of criterion measures for that class of manpower training programs that have come to be designated as "youth work training programs" (Herman & Sadofsky, 1966). The majority of such programs, which have been

under federal sponsorship, are intended to serve young adults from poverty-level backgrounds who are considered socially and culturally disadvantaged. Although at least one large-scale program has had as its primary short-term objective that of preventing youngsters from dropping out of school (i.e., the Neighborhood Youth Corps, In School Program), most of the programs are concerned with enhancing the "employability" of those who have left the formal academic setting.*

Through an analysis of various specific outcomes--based on data obtained from one youth-work training program considered reasonably representative in its design and enrollee population (i.e., Neighborhood Youth Corps, Out of School Program)--it is expected that a set of guidelines for choosing the most useful measures of program "success" can be formulated and applied: (a) in evaluating the effectiveness of this, or similar, youth-work training programs, (b) in the validation of tests or other predictive devices for selection, guidance, or placement (e.g., paper and pencil tests, ratings, work samples, etc.) and (c) when relevant performance measures (i.e., dependent variables) are to be selected in the planning and conduct of research programs.

Within the primary study purpose, it should be clear that it is impractical for any single criterion study to pin down all outcome variables pertinent to virtually all youth training programs (present or prospective). Such programs not only possess a number of variations in their short-term intentions and training methods, but are modified frequently enough, in

---

*For descriptions of the various youth-work training programs and their stated, or implied, goals see Mangum (1969) and Levitan and Mangum (1969).

those respects, to warrant a degree of continual updating for their systems of outcome measures. What does exist, however, is the opportunity to demonstrate one model for programmatic criterion research, based on variables with the broadest applicability across programs (i.e., "core" criteria) and to help clarify crucial issues in setting standards that must concern any youth-work training program forced to deal with complex, behaviorally-based, objectives.

B. Background

The necessity for undertaking the development of suitable criterion measures for youth-work training programs arose from the more immediate requirement to validate a battery of measures intended for use as guidance and counseling tools. The instruments that comprise the battery deal with various attitudinal, vocational and reasoning skills, and were designed explicitly for use with disadvantaged adolescents of relatively low verbal skill levels enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program (Freeberg, 1968; Freeberg, 1970). In a preliminary development phase, various test characteristics were examined with external validity assessed solely on the basis of available, concurrent criteria in the form of counselor and work supervisor ratings.

Validation using one type of short-term criterion is inherently limiting. It is far more desirable in any test development effort for the value of the appraisal tools to rest on a variety of as long range and relevant measures of program outcomes as possible. For example, the choice of counselor and work supervisor ratings should be predicated on their demonstrated value as outcome measures which should, in turn, be determined by their relation

(or relevance) to other longer-term outcome measures that may consist of a variety of vocational and social adjustment variables.

When faced with the task of choosing criteria for a youth-work training program, however, it became apparent that there was little coherent research material available to provide sufficient knowledge of the "criterion domain" from which one could select defensible variables of known measurement characteristics and accessibility. Without suitable information to define the value of specific criterion measures, research or evaluation studies involving work-training program enrollees have been forced to depend almost entirely on rational bases (usually not made explicit by the investigator) for the choice of what can be considered untested dependent variables. Thus, in some studies, scaled values of "self-esteem", "work motivation" or "social adjustment" have been embodied in one, or a few, questionnaire items. In others, more formally developed scales may be applied or the investigator may choose to infer the same constructs exclusively on the basis of observation by others (e.g., employers, family members, peers), from records of police contacts, number and types of jobs held, etc. Any, or all, such variables may be of value. The point is that there has been no systematic, empirical test of that value, in terms of measurement properties and relationships between criterion variables, essential for determining the dimensions being tapped by any set of outcome measures. It is this lack of available evidence to support the investigator's choice of particular criteria, from the pool of potentially usable outcome variables, that can often lead to ambiguous measurement with consequent weakening of comparability, or continuity, in the criteria chosen and in the conclusions reached by different studies.

The effect is perhaps more acutely felt in attempts to construct and validate predictive appraisal devices or tests, because the suitability of the criterion measures (i.e., their availability, reliability, relevance, bias, factor composition) can be reflected directly and immediately in the choice of test content and the levels of validity achievable (Thorndike, 1949).

Since any youth-work training program must depend on behavioral assessment (i.e., tests and measures) for conducting its guidance and research, or for evaluating its impact, the conclusion is inescapable that any measures used for such a program "can be no better than the criteria which define it" (Krug, 1961). This central role for criteria in the development and application of any measurement system has been stressed repeatedly in the psychometric literature, although often slighted in practice to the detriment of various social and educational programs. It is understandably difficult and costly to accept Guilford's (1954) recommendation that "as much time be spent on developing criteria to validate tests as on the tests themselves" since, as he admits, this means "doing the hard things first" (Guilford, 1954, Ch. 14). Nevertheless, repeated failure to deal explicitly with criterion problems has left major efforts in behavioral appraisal and evaluation with a legacy of unrealized improvements in validity: improvements that are becoming more necessary to achieve if widely used appraisal tools are ever to meet long standing vocational needs and if the legal requirements for demonstrated validity of tests are to be fulfilled (Polermo, 1969).

By attending to criterion variables at this stage in the development of guidance and counseling tools,it is hoped that, in addition to demonstrating the advantages of proper choice and measurement of program goals, costly criterion inadequacies which might subsequently affect large-scale test validation efforts can be minimized.

C. Concepts of Criterion Development

In order to provide appropriate perspective for the purposes and techniques of the present study, it is of value to review customary approaches to criterion development along with some of the complex issues that can arise when these are applied to the definition and measurement of work-training program goals. Although considered separately below, these issues and concepts are highly interrelated and should be viewed as different facets of an overall process of criterion determination.

1. Single vs. Multiple Criteria: The search for a single criterion as the standard of "success," for any educational or social program, appears deceptively appealing, but can prove difficult to justify in its application. Typically, for youth-work training programs, the single outcome of choice used to represent an "employability" objective has been a frequency count of the number of enrollees who obtain employment over some defined period following program completion. Such a measure has rational justification and certainly represents one of the more important program outcomes. But, whether that or any other single criterion variable can serve as an ultimate standard, optimally informative of program accomplishment, is questionable for several reasons. First, it is generally untrue that a single measure such as a job-count index, by itself,

possesses the all-encompassing criterion value assumed. If, for example, most ex-enrollees of youth-work training programs had obtained employment at such jobs as laborers or dishwashers, a simple employment count alone would be considered by most observers to represent an incomplete, if not misleading, standard of program accomplishment. Additional outcome data that are job-related would obviously be called for in the form of the "quality" of the jobs obtained, and based perhaps on job level, salary, advancement possibilities, length of employment, etc. In practice, therefore, even those who deal with, or espouse, a single goal for a work-training program often intend to consider at least several specific variables that constitute a broader employment dimension.

A second reason why it is questionable to choose a single program goal is that it is self-defeating to put all of the "criterion eggs" in one basket, especially when that single objective involves a vocational measure. Types of jobs and their availability can vary regionally, seasonally, on the basis of changing local or national economic conditions and in the patterns of minority-group discrimination imposed. A training program that had properly inculcated in its enrollees the means and the desire to obtain and hold a job might, therefore, be judged unfairly where that judgment hinged on one specific criterion measure (or class of criteria) affected by a number of conditions beyond the control of the program under evaluation. In order to overcome such biasing effects, it seems logical to consider additional important objectives, other than those that deal with purely vocational, "job-getting" outcomes. This can only be done by demonstrating changes in the characteristics of the individual enrollee

(e.g., in his work motivation, vocational planning ability, personal adjustment, acquisition of intellectual or technical skills, etc.), all of which might have been favorably influenced by the program--and highly related to later success in obtaining jobs--but not verifiable where there is total dependence on a single job-count index at some narrowly defined point (or period) in time.

A third shortcoming,in being dependent primarily on a single criterion, is that the one form of measured outcome becomes the basis for the program's existence--i.e., the criterion defines the program. Thus, whatever its title might imply, a training program that seeks to measure as its sole outcome scores on reading achievement level or, perhaps, the number of enrollees who remain in school can, by definition, be considered only a "remedial reading" program or a "school-retention" program--nothing more! Assumptions about other outcomes that might enter into, or be associated with, the single criterion chosen are purely gratuitous if they are unmeasured and undemonstrated. In this context, it should be apparent that a relatively simple, unitary criterion is also unrealistic. People who design a youth work training program and those responsible for its conduct (e.g., counselors and work supervisors) do not behave, in practice, as if there is one single overriding outcome to be achieved. They seek instead to effect many different enrollee behavioral changes of varied, often undetermined, value.

A fourth, and probably a major drawback in resorting to a single criterion, stems from the restrictions imposed in understanding how a training program is functioning or succeeding. That is, it limits available knowledge regarding which particular program components might be

differentially affecting which aspects of the criterion. Dunnette (1963) emphasizes essentially the same point in discussing the design and application of measures for predicting job success, when he argues that only by the use of complex, multiple criteria can one "learn more about the total constructs" that are (or should be) measured by tests. It seems equally likely that the functional complexities of a youth-work training program would best lend themselves to appraisal by more than a relatively simple, single criterion score.

2. Criterion Measures over Time (Proximal, Distal and Ultimate Goals: The choice of any goals and their measurement can only have meaning along a time continuum. Certain goal formulations imply a relatively immediate capability to measure the outcomes specified; others imply relatively lengthy time periods before information bearing on the outcomes can be made available. Major issues of criterion definition, cost, accessibility and demonstrated value are influenced by the time constraints imposed and are conventionally considered under temporal designations of the criteria as "proximal", "distal" or "ultimate" measures.

a. Proximal or short-term criteria are those considered most immediately available and usually the most accessible or easily obtained. In a youth-work training program, such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, these might be available at the time the enrollee is "completing"* the program and

---

*Program "completion" is a relatively arbitrary term since the enrollees can, and do, leave the program as they choose. The nominal enrollment period designated for the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school program, however, is one of six months.

consist of quantitative ratings by various program personnel (e.g., counselors and work supervisors), peers (e.g., fellow enrollees), self-evaluations (e.g., attitudinal measures) or forms of administrative information recorded by the project (e.g., work site absences, number of work site assignments).

b. The distal or intermediate term criteria would be those measures available within some reasonable period after the enrollee has left the program and might include various aspects of employment, vocational, social and family adjustment, motivation or attitudes and information on specific post-program experiences such as contacts with legal authorities; use of USTES, etc.

c. It is, certainly, the ultimate or long-term criteria that represent the most desirable ones conceptually but the most difficult about which to obtain information (often beyond the bounds of practical capability). These tend to be the criteria for which the broad dimensions can often be agreed upon--e.g., "vocational success" or social "adjustment"--but the most difficult to define explicitly. Just what constitutes vocational success over many years or a working lifetime is not an easy task to determine. Collection of such ultimate forms of criterion information may require essentially prohibitive expenditures of effort and money beyond what is considered

justifiable for program purposes. Or, similarly, it may be considered too ambitious, if not logically inappropriate, to assume that the effects of any youth work training program could be expected to extend beyond a period of several months, or a few years, at most. In that case, goal statements should be translated into measures that are "less ultimate" and set within a more appropriate, arbitrarily agreed-upon time span. The shorter that time span the more obtainable some forms of long range criteria are likely to be.

By dealing with criteria in this temporal framework, there are improved possibilities for understanding the measures chosen through recognition of their overlap and their interrelationships. In addition, it becomes clearer in formulating and applying criteria--especially the immediate and intermediate ones--what assumptions are being made, rationally and empirically, regarding the "respresentativeness" of each criterion measure for some form of longer range goal intention. The practical advantage gained is expressed most clearly in the statement that: "As one moves from the ultimate towards more and more immediate criteria, there will be more and more room for statistical considerations to supplement the rational in evaluation of the proposed criterion measures" (Thorndike, 1949, p. 123). It is only through such statistical considerations that criterion representativeness and value can eventually be determined.

3. Measurement Concepts: For criteria, as for any test instruments, the basis for selecting the most functional variables should stem from knowledge of their measurement characteristics. They should, in other words, be reliable or reproducable, relevant to other criteria (i.e., "valid" in the conventional sense) and as objective, or bias-free, as possible.

a. Relevance or equivalence: Given any defined outcome measures at any proximal point in time there remains an obligation to demonstrate the relevance of those measures to longer-range criteria. Practical needs to substitute the more quickly and cheaply obtainable criteria for the costlier, longer-term, varieties can only be met by reasonable evidence to support those choices intelligently. This, in effect, constitutes what Wherry (1957) has stressed as a need for "intelligent substitution" of the more obtainable (short-term) criteria for the more distal ones. In the case of youth-work training program, various short-term criteria derived from ratings by others, enrollee self-appraisals and attitudinal scales, measures of various skills acquired, etc., may be decided upon as relatively easy to obtain and reasonably justifiable at the time the enrollee has completed, or is leaving, the program. However, the most important problem remaining to be solved would be one of specifying the extent to which each criterion measure at program completion is equivalent

(relevant) to outcomes deemed more important at later points in time (i.e., longer-term patterns of vocational success and social adjustment). In order to accomplish this, it is possible to compare underlying dimensions for the same or similar criteria obtained, at different points in time, for different individuals in a cross-sectional comparison. Far more definitive and useful (although costly) would be use of a follow-up, longitudinal sample that allowed for direct correlations between earlier and later scores on criterion measures obtained for the same individuals. When immediate criteria are found virtually unrelated to longer-term measures is very difficult to justify their use on any basis, however easily obtainable they may be and whatever the rationale for their choice or the degree of objectivity they may be shown to possess.

b. Reliability: Although not as critical to criterion determination as relevance, the reliability of any criterion measure serves as a limiting value which can attenuate its relationship to other, more reliable, criteria (Thorndike, 1949, Ch. 5). Some moderate level of consistency should be demonstrated if the measure is to have any value in support of some broader criterion construct. The ability to demonstrate performance consistency by measuring and remeasuring the same behaviors over a short time period (i.e., analogous to test-retest reliability) represents a luxury that is usually

impractical to attain for many of the criteria that would be applicable to a youth work training program (e.g., length of stay on first job). More often, reliability of the criterion measure can only be demonstrated by showing the internal consistency of a multi-item scale and by the relationships between various criteria, grouped either on an a priori logical basis (e.g., "motivation" as reflected in number of jobs the individual tried for, visits made to employment agencies, responses to appropriate questionnaire items), or from factors on which similar criterion measures are shown to cluster. Therefore, the wider the variety of desirable long-range criteria that can be applied, the greater the opportunity to increase reliability of a given criterion construct by increasing the range of behaviors sampled.

c. Bias: Adverse effects on both the relevance and reliability of a criterion can stem from systematic biases that differentially influence scores obtained from various subgroups of the population being considered. For criterion data obtained on the performance of present or former youth-work training program enrollees, subgroup biases may be introduced in various measures of vocational success because of different employment opportunities in various geographic areas, differences in professional capability in rater leniency, or in training opportunities from project to project. Many significant biases can be difficult to identify, requiring

extensive research efforts to do so, while others may be difficult to correct or impractical to eliminate even when identified. Where a particular form of identified bias cannot be eliminated, its effects can be minimized by randomizing its occurrence through all subgroups to as great an extent as possible, or by removing its effects statistically. A range of possible biasing effects to be aware of in the development of criteria have been outlined and discussed by Brogden and Taylor (1950), under categories of "deficiencies" in choosing pertinent criterion elements, "contamination" by the introduction of extraneous elements, "inequality" of scale units and "distortion" resulting from improper weighting of criterion elements.

4. Criterion Availability and Practical Constraints: Despite an awareness of proper approaches to definition and measurement of criteria, there are additional issues that can impose overriding, practical limitations on the most carefully designed attempts to develop or apply those measures. Among these are:

a. The accessibility of certain forms of desirable criterion data and associated costs required to obtain the information may be prohibitive enough to make use of the measures impractical and require the search for substitute measures. Longer-term criteria for a youth-work training program are the ones that can require particular time and effort in their collection, since the

individuals about whom post-program performance data are to be collected must be located (often at very high cost) and, once located, be willing to provide the required information. Where it is impractical to obtain information directly from an enrollee or ex-enrollee, and where corroborative information is sought, it may be necessary to utilize information from public sources (e.g., law enforcement agencies, local state and federal agencies, credit agencies) or from employers and other observers (e.g., friends, family members). Even for those "external" sources, however, accessibility can remain a problem in terms of cost, accuracy and, equally important, in terms of ethical considerations. There may, for example, be some reluctance on the part of an interviewer (as well as other persons, and agencies) to violate the individual's right to privacy by providing information with, or without, his knowledge--and rightly so. The ramifications of these points, which are only mentioned in passing here, are critical to all aspects of research and evaluation with youth-work training programs and will be considered in detail in Section II of this paper.

b. The objectivity or subjectivity of criterion measures are a function of the nature of the program and the degree of information accessibility. Ideally, the more objectively verifiable the outcome measures chosen the more accurate

they are assumed to be; while the greater the human intervention involved the greater the subjectivity and the greater the assumed chances for inaccuracies. Those criteria highest on objectivity would be the ones based on routinely and easily recorded performance indices (e.g., absences, units of production output on a job). Further away from highest level of objectivity can be found the systematically derived observational data dealing with reasonably observable aspects of performance (e.g., routine supervisor ratings of job competence). Still less objectivity may be assigned to factual statements, by the individual, about himself--but potentially capable of being checked for accuracy (e.g., police contacts, salary); with the more subjective portion of the continuum reserved for self-evaluation in the form of attitudinal measures (e.g., vocational plans, motivation, family adjustment, job satisfaction, etc.).* The more subjective the criterion sources the greater the care necessary to guard against measurement inaccuracies and to demonstrate their relevance to (i.e., correlations with) the more objective outcomes.

---

*Purely anecdotal, unstructured, response information (whether observational or self-evaluative) would represent the extreme subjective end of an objective-subjective continuum, but is not considered pertinent to the concepts of criterion development presented here as long as the information remains nonsystematic in its collection and unquantified in its application.

c. The generalizability of any criteria constitutes an important constraint in their applicability to a broad class of programs or evaluative needs. Where broad goals cutting across similar programs can be agreed upon and the samples involved remain reasonably comparable, some form of "evaluative continuity" in the use of generalizable outcomes can be an achievement of obvious importance. Part of any criterion package should certainly include a variety of specific criteria where they are logical for differential program intentions. That is, some measure(s) of verbal skill should be applied where remedial training constitutes a program component; or, for measuring specific areas of technical skill where those are being taught. But, the primary risk in too great dependence on criteria that are highly program-specific for a conceptually similar group of programs (e.g., manpower training) is that where program components are continually changing, through practical necessity or other external demands (e.g., job markets demanding entirely new technical skills), the evaluation system assumes the costly risk of continually "chasing" those changing program goals.

d. Despite the practical desirability of using widely applicable criteria, the extent to which that intention

can be accomplished is often further limited by what has been termed the dynamic quality of measured outcomes (Bass, 1962; Ghiselli, 1960). This goes beyond intentional changes in program design and associated criteria dictated by feedback of results. The concept has been used to refer to changes over time in the measurement characteristics of the same, or similar, criteria. For example, a battery of guidance tests may be reasonably predictive of work supervisors' ratings at the completion of the training program, drop to a much lower level of validity for on-the-job performance ratings six months after the enrollee leaves the program and then show a return to the initially higher levels perhaps a year and a half later (using essentially the same rating criterion). Thus, in choosing outcome measures there may be a built-in constraint to narrow those choices to criteria that are most stable in terms of predictability and relevance at different points over time--or at least to know which criteria are subject to such dynamic change and what the criterion "mix" should be at each segment in time.

e. Existing program demands constitute the last of the constraints considered here and can be viewed as primary and pervasive in the choice of criteria for study. The constraint stems from the necessary, logical, connection between objectives,

program content and operation. Although it has been pointed out that the criteria chosen can be said "to define the program," it is equally true that, once a youth-work training program is operational, criterion choice is limited for practical purposes by the nature and conduct of that program. The criterion measures must, under such a circumstance, be selected with the intention of reflecting program components to a reasonable extent, since there is little logic in measuring outcomes not likely to be (nor claimed to be) affected as a result of participation in the program. As a somewhat extreme example, one might obtain evidence to show improvements in dental hygiene resulting from enrollment in a non residential, youth-work training program by measuring explicit variables reflecting the enrollee's dental status. Although a desirable outcome, its logical choice as a criterion of priority could be challenged if there is no information concerning dental habits provided as a program component; nor any attempt made to provide dental care directly.

All of the above concepts in criterion development should eventually enter into the design of a total and flexible system of outcome measures. Where the data of the present study are available to do so, these concepts will be applied in guiding this initial overview of criteria for use with a youth-work training program.

II. Method

A. Selection of Criterion Variables

In order to measure objectives for a youth-work training program it is necessary to design an initial set of potentially useful criterion variables, from which the best ones can be pruned as a result of empirical analyses. The intent is to cover an adequate range of variables based on a suitable rationale: a step that has been stressed as crucial, if misleading criterion dimensions are to be avoided (Nagle, 1953). The process is best initiated by a broad (but brief) description of the major features of a youth work training program, highlighting its implied and explicit goals followed by a logical "translation" of those goals into more specific criterion categories within which variables and scales can be defined. The measures desired should be as objectively specifiable as possible and should also draw upon experience from previous research in which similar criterion constructs have been applied.

1. Characteristics of a Youth-Work Training Program

Major features of a youth-work training program from which categories of objectives can be defined for the analytical purposes of this study are to be based on a brief description of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Out-of-School Program (Federal Register, 1969). This full-time, nonresidential program may be considered sufficiently representative, in both the enrollee population served and in its broad functions, to meet present study needs.

As for any youth-work training program, (and as previously indicated) the overall goal that provides the basis for program design is the enhancement of enrollee employability. To accomplish this intent of improving the individual's capability to obtain and hold a job, the local sponsor of a

Neighborhood Youth Corps Project (NYC) must provide a setting in which school dropouts receive guidance and counseling services and an opportunity to work, for at least a minimum wage, on some form of "suitable" job. A work supervisor who is an employee of the organization in which the enrollee receives his work-training (often a governmental agency) maintains an informal relationship with the NYC project through a project guidance counselor who is professionally responsible for the progress of the enrollee. Other than the requirement for vocational guidance counseling and supervised work experience, there have been no rigidly defined program components, curriculum materials or specific technical skills to be acquired.*

Although there is no formal program termination point (i.e., "graduation" or "completion"), the nominally prescribed period of enrollment is considered to be one of six months. An enrollee may of course leave the program any time he chooses. The enrollee population served is, by definition, from a poverty-level background (based on family income) and composed of school dropouts who have generally been unable to obtain either suitable or regular employment on their own. Age ranges have varied since the inception of the program but have remained roughly within the adolescent age levels of 14 to 17 years.

The structural aspects and functional requirements of the program lead to reasonably explicit and identifiable sets of assumptions, or intentions,

---

*Formal requirements for remedial training in verbal and arithmetic skills were first instituted in the summer of 1970 for all NYC projects under the NYC II Program. Although many projects had undertaken such skill training on their own prior to that time, it was purely voluntary (often under specially funded studies) and often temporary in its availability to the enrollees.

concerning specific objectives that are held by program administrators and professionals. For example, it is generally assumed that the guidance and counseling services provided are instructional with regard to vocational possibilities, training requirements, the value of improving academic standing (e.g., return to school or formal education), job seeking skills, (e.g., how and where to look for jobs; appropriate interview behaviors) and proper on-the-job behaviors, (e.g., acceptance of supervision, getting along with co-workers, coming to work on time). In addition, the guidance may extend to personal problem areas and overall social adjustment outside of the work setting (e.g., family problems, legal difficulties, and handling of finances). All of these are closely complemented by paid, on the job, experience intended to enhance enrollee work-related adjustment, familiarity with job requirements, organizational expectations and in some cases (depending upon the type of work experience) development of specific technical skills.

The combination of counseling and work experience are viewed, in turn, as the means for instilling personal confidence in the enrollee regarding his ability to function in a work setting and in his desire to achieve vocationally--the effects of which would, hopefully, ramify to all areas of social and vocational adjustment.

From such a broad constellation of program characteristics and assumptions it is possible to postulate sets, or "categories," of general outcomes along with specific variables and scales that might define those categories.

2. Description of Criterion Categories and Measures

It should be evident from previous discussion that for an initial examination of youth-work training program criteria it is desirable to specify

sets of criterion categories along with a fairly wide range of associated outcome variables, that are both logically justifiable and reasonably practical to obtain. Such variables can be considered under two major headings based on their applicability at different points in time. One set deals with outcomes that define how well the enrollee fared at, or near, the "completion" of his participation in the program, while the other criteria are applicable, largely, to post-program periods during which longer-term effects on enrollee performance could be expected to occur. There is a degree of appropriate overlap in a number of the criterion categories and variables at these two time periods (e.g., those dealing with personal-social adjustment areas). Other categories are of necessity unique (e.g., all aspects of post-program full-time job experience since they can only apply to enrollees who have left the program). The specific variables and scales applied to each category are referred to under "data sources" using their numbered designations in the appropriate criterion questionnaire.*

Program Completion Criteria: representing short-term outcomes consist of the following categories and associated variables used in their measurement:

a. Vocational planning ability: can be considered intrinsic to the counseling and guidance component of a youth-work training program, particularly that aspect of guidance which provides information concerning available occupations

*The Enrollee Program Completion Questionnaire is shown in Appendix B and the Post-Program Questionnaire in Appendix C. Evaluations by counselors and work supervisors are presented in Appendix D and an Employer Evaluation Scale in Appendix F.

and the steps necessary to achieve realistic vocational goals. This category of enrollee performance capability deals with vocational plans formulated at the time the enrollee is "completing" NYC and the ways in which he expects to implement those plans. Willingness to plan, the extent of planning and the degree of reality are basic theoretical concerns in vocational guidance and have been considered in the research literature as important to all vocationally-oriented behaviors, as well as to the eventual degree of job success achieved (Stephenson, 1955; Super, 1957). Variables in this category are intended to reflect vocational planning intentions of the enrollee, his overall concern for various job characteristics in formulating those plans, and the "quality" of his planning. In line with the desirability of criterion variables being as objective as possible, the enrollee's planning intentions require responses that are as behaviorally oriented as possible. Data sources--consist of Post-Program Questionnaire items 17, 19, and 20 to 26; each scored as separate variables. Item weights for 18(a) through 18(g) are summed to provide a single "Awareness of Job Characteristics" scale score.

b. Feelings of vocational adequacy: is a category intended to deal mainly with the enrollee's explicit perceptions of his chances for success as a potential employee. This

attitudinal construct can be considered as a reflection of the degree to which the enrollee feels he can "make it" in a work setting after he leaves the training program (i.e., vocational self-confidence or readiness). Rational bases for the choice of the construct stem from specific intentions by counselors and work supervisors to instill feelings of vocational adequacy in the enrollee, through guidance that apprises him of his skills and capabilities and through work experience that offers familiarity with a job setting as well as the chance to develop proper work habits and skills. The concept is probably related to the more widely used "self-esteem," or self-concept dimensions (Wylie, 1961) that have also appeared as scales in various studies of vocational development among disadvantaged adolescents (Freeberg, 1970; Hunt & Hardt, 1966; Walther & Magnusson, 1967); in theoretical formulations of career choice (Super, 1957) and in studies of adolescent vocational adjustment (Holland, 1964). However, the scales and items chosen here, are intended to be a more direct and "objective" reflection of intended behaviors for youth work-training program outcomes than the often vaguely defined and diffuse self-concept measures customarily applied as predictors.

Data sources--consist of the items of a"Vocational Adequacy" scale with item weights summed to provide a single scale. The scale is made up of program completion questionnaire items 10 to 16 with items 20 and 20(a) also representing aspects of the same construct.

c. Personal-social adjustment: represents a criterion category with high "face validity" or logical relevance. It is considered particularly desirable per se, by program professionals, to assist the enrollee in achieving a level of social adjustment and personal satisfaction that allows him to function adequately in a job, avoid legal difficulties and achieve some degree of personal satisfaction in his family life. In defining information needs for work-training programs, two primary areas of personal-social adjustment have generally been considered of importance. One has been designated as "community adjustment" (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1969) and is considered to be reflected in delinquent behavior as measured by involvement with the police. Logically, however, this concept can be extended further and touch upon personal-community adjustment variables that concern involvement with other members of the community, as well as the individual's health status and financial planning or monetary responsibility. A second major adjustment area for consideration deals with the enrollee's relationships with his family, particularly the extent to which they are a supportive rather than an

obstructive influence on his efforts to improve. It has been suggested that patterns of family responsibility, demands and encouragement influence critical aspects of vocational, academic and social performance among disadvantaged youngsters (Gordon, 1965).

Data sources--include questionnaire items 32 to 34 as the variables representing family adjustment and 35 to 41 as the community adjustment variables. In addition, data on police contacts were obtained, when available, from local law enforcement agencies as an external check on the enrollee-provided information.

d. Work-training program adjustment and capability: is intended to represent a category of external criterion judgments (as opposed to enrollee self-evaluation) indicative of the degree of overall adjustment and success achieved as a result of participation in the youth-work training program. The customary criterion measures used for this purpose consist of formal ratings by those who are in a position to make appropriate observations of enrollee performance. Several such evaluative sources are readily available from a youth work-training program. One is from program professionals (usually guidance counselors) and the other is from those responsible for the training and supervision of the enrollee in the work setting (i.e., a work supervisor). A third potentially useful source is peer ratings, for which no systematic research

applications are known with youth-work training program populations. This type of criterion measure has been shown to be of value for a variety of training programs (Wherry & Fryer, 1949) and appears worth examining in this situation. There might, however, appear to be greater difficulties than usual in obtaining peer ratings from disadvantaged adolescent groups. Among those are an unusual degree of reluctance to make specific evaluative judgments about fellow enrollees and difficulties in obtaining a sufficient sample of enrollees, well enough acquainted with one another in the work training setting, to provide meaningful ratings.

Data sources--are based on three rating scales: (a) An eleven (11) item counselor rating scale used for both male and female enrollees, (b) Two, ten-item Work-Supervisor scales--one for male enrollees and one for females--with several items differing on each of those two scales (Appendix E). The Counselor and Work Supervisor scale items were derived from scales used in a previous study of NYC enrollees (Freeberg, 1968) and (c) Two types of Peer Rating scales (Appendix B) that were necessitated by variations in the nature of rater-ratee acquaintance. One set of these items could only be utilized for those peers whose acquaintance with the ratee had been in the NYC project and/or on a social basis, while the other set is applicable to those whose acquaintance is only social (i.e.,

outside of NYC exclusively). Since it was not practical to obtain criterion data for all enrollees at any given project, those who did appear in the sample were asked to choose two fellow enrollees to be rated. This was seen as a means of increasing the odds for obtaining at least one rating on as many enrollee respondents in the sample as possible.

e. Work motivation: could probably be considered one of the more widely agreed-upon standards of enrollee behavior, applicable to any broad definition of "success" at program completion. The counseling and work experience components of the program clearly emphasize this motivational outcome. Enrollee expressions of a desire to succeed vocationally--as indicated by willingness to take specific actions (e.g., job training, searching for employment)--constitute one of the means possible for measuring such a criterion category at program completion. Scores obtained from scaled items that dealt with general feelings about the importance of obtaining and holding a job have shown modest correlations with counselor and work supervisor criterion ratings for NYC enrollees (Freeberg, 1968). However, in order to test a more objectively definable index of motivation, the measure to be utilized here as a criterion is intended to go beyond generalized attitudes about employment and deal with specific, although hypothetical, opportunities to make vocationally- and educationally-related decisions, in a "simulated" choice

situation, where a particular job being sought has a high degree of desirability for the enrollee.

In addition, although there are few if any objective behavioral measures at program completion that reflect performance motivation directly, two pieces of administrative information were considered to be of value for examination as motivational outcomes. These are absences from job site(s) and the number of job site changes made by the enrollee during his enrollment in NYC.

Data sources--are the job lists on page 10 of the questionnaire, scored in terms of total number of jobs selected. Items 44 and 45 were scored as separate variables and items 46(a) through 46(g) utilized summed item weights to obtain a single "Work Motivation Scale" score.

Enrollee absences from the work site(s) and the number of work site assignments were obtained from the NYC project records, with values adjusted for length of program enrollment in the scoring of these variables.

Post-Program Criteria: represent the longer-range outcomes that might logically be affected by participation in the youth-work training program. (As will be apparent in the descriptions below, certain of the criterion categories and their associated variables can, of necessity, apply only to former enrollees with employment experience; others are equally applicable to those with employment experience and those who never held a job after leaving the training program.)

a. Extent or level of employment: is the category that encompasses information undoubtedly considered of primary importance in determining the degree of success for a youth-work training program, over any post-program period. Measures that define the extent to which the enrollee eventually achieves productive, remunerative employment would possess a high degree of rational validity if their value were to be based on the professional judgment of work-training program experts. In addition, the relevance of these criteria to longer-term vocational achievement might be expected to prove significant, since early job performance tends to be one of the better predictors of future job success. Generally, criteria dealing with the nature and extent of employment have been a cornerstone for a number of vocational development theories that depend for their verification on measures dealing with occupational choices, job advancement, sequence of jobs held, duration of stay, etc., (Borow, 1964). Similar vocational performance variables that are considered applicable (and available) as youth-work training criteria would include: the extent of employment since leaving NYC (i.e., whether enrollee held, or now holds, a full-time job); length of stay on job(s); hours worked per week and an index of the "quality" of the jobs held based on a combined rating of skill,

status level, and advancement possibilities. In the present study, derivation of a composite "Job Quality" score for the most recent or presently held job was based largely on information from the National Opinion Research Center job status scales (Duncan, Hatt, & North, 1961), the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (U.S. Employment Service, 1965), and the Occupational Outlook Handbook (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1969). Data sources--consist of responses to the Post-Program Questionnaire for items 11 through 16 and item 23; each scored as separate variables. Job quality was assigned an appropriate weight of "1," "2," or "3" based on the guidelines for this categorization shown in Appendix D. It was also intended that the information be verified--(where practical or available)--from USTES and/or social security records.

b. Work stability and work performance: cover what should be logically related categories involving the capability to retain a job over some period of time (stability) and to perform successfully in a work setting. Assessment of on-the-job performance has long constituted a major category of outcomes in industrial training research (Burtt, 1942; Ghiselli & Brown, 1955; Tiffin & McCormick, 1958) with the number of different indices, customarily utilized to specify this construct, ranging from unit work-output measures and "creative" achievements, to

proficiency ratings by others (e.g., supervisors). Those first two forms of criterion data are relatively impractical to obtain for the enrollee population of interest in this study so that ratings become the primary source of outcome information concerned with job proficiency. The job proficiency score can be obtained from ratings made by a present (or former) employer and would of course represent a variable with a high degree of logical relevance as a youth-work training outcome.

Job stability as a measure has also been considered relevant for a number of occupational research programs (Holland, 1964; Parnes, Miljus, & Spitz, 1969; Super, 1957), but its role among criteria for youth-work training program is relatively unknown. Specific variables that most conveniently define the measure are the number of jobs held during a given post-program period, the length of time employed on each job and the reasons for job termination. Data sources--for these categories consist of questionnaire items 16, 17, 17a, 23, 24, 25 and 58, each scored as separate variables. A four-item Employer Rating Scale is presented in Appendix F and yields a single score consisting of the sum of the four weighted items. The brief scale contains several item types that have generally proven effective in employer assessments (Owens & Jewell, 1969).

c. Vocational adjustment: should serve as an important adjunct to the high priority job performance outcomes. An increasing amount of vocational guidance research has come to focus on the personal adjustment category, by dealing with measures of the individual's perceptions of his work environment and the ways in which the work setting interacts with his values and needs (Dunnette, Campbell, & Hakel, 1967; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Some empirical basis for the potential relevance of variables in this category exist, since measures of job satisfaction appear to have moderate effects on worker productivity and job stability (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964). Although often difficult to specify as a measure because of its multifactor composition, determination of worker satisfaction has nevertheless obtained strong support over the years as a useful form of outcome measure (Dunnette, Campbell & Hakel, 1967; Heron, 1954; Hoppock, 1935; Wherry, 1958). Problems in measurement, stemming from a need for more precise definition of the characteristics of job satisfaction have stimulated a number of attempts to identify the factors that comprise the construct (Kendall, Smith, Hulin & Locke, 1963; Sedlacek, 1966; Wherry, 1958). However, uncritical and direct application of items from many of those factored scales to disadvantaged adolescents may be questionable since, in most instances, they are based on samples of white-collar professionals, semi-professionals

and clerical workers. Fortunately, Hinrichs (1968) has recently derived a set of job satisfaction factors for a wide range of industrial personnel with differential factor patterns reported for different employee levels. That information allows for the selection of scale items somewhat more appropriate to the jobs that former NYC enrollees would be likely to enter. With some changes in item wording, nine items for a Job Adjustment scale were derived from the factors presented in Hinrichs' study. Data source--is the nine item "Job Adjustment" Scale utilizing items 26 through 34 of the Post-Program Questionnaire which yields a single score based on the sum of the item weights. Item 22 is considered somewhat similar to job satisfaction, but is stated in terms of the extent to which vocational experiences in general have met the enrollees expectations and is treated as a separate criterion variable.

d. Personal-social adjustment: is a category for which variables were selected on the basis of essentially the same rationale as presented for the Program Completion Questionnaire. However, some additional personal adjustment variables can be considered as more logical, and/or available, after the enrollee has left the program. One is the variable of number of visits to a physician, which has had widespread conventional use as a criterion measure indicative of personal adjustment, family mobility (i.e., number of residences since leaving

the work-training program) and use of financial credit for making purchases.

Data sources--for those enrollees who hold, or have held, full-time employment (Post-Program Questionnaire: Section I) consist of items 8, 10 and 43 through 55 which are all treated as separate variables.

For those enrollees who have never been employed full-time, the adjustment variables (in addition to items 8 and 10) are to be found in items 28 through 38 of Section II; with all items treated as separate variables.

Number of police contacts were obtained from local law enforcement agencies as representative of community adjustment.

e. Work-seeking motivation and planning: are based on a rationale similar to that provided for the Program Completion Questionnaire. However, in the selection of specific variables to define these categories, a number of additional experiences during the post-program period (i.e., work experiences) can be used as more "objective" measures of the enrollee's willingness to seek employment, the degree to which he perceives work as a worthwhile pursuit and his ability to plan for his vocational future. As will be evident from the specific variables chosen, the motivational and planning categories are assumed to overlap considerably since much activity that involves vocational planning also implies a strong motivational component.

Motivational outcomes are to be reflected in such measurable activities as: whether or not the enrollee is currently working full time or has held a full-time job, the amount of additional training or formal schooling he has obtained, the length of time after leaving NYC before he found the first job; the number of sources utilized in finding the first job and the reasons for leaving jobs. For those former enrollees who were not previously employed, there are potentially useful motivational variables dealing with attempts at further schooling, stated intentions to seek employment and the degree of concern with various characteristics of jobs. This latter form of measure is presented as a "Concern for Job Characteristics" scale that incorporates content customarily used in construction of job-satisfaction scales.

Criterion variables dealing more specifically with vocational planning skills are derived from enrollee estimates of how high in status and salary he expects to go in the present job, what plans he has for the relatively near future--including his longer range occupational goals--how he plans to achieve the intended goals (scaled in terms of planning "appropriateness" and "quality") and the extent to which he has saved money since leaving NYC.

Data sources-- for motivational variables in Section I of the Post-Program Questionnaire are derived from items 11,

15, 17(d) and 18 through 21; each scored as separate variables. The closely related planning skills variables are obtained from items 35 through 42, each of which are scored separately.

For those enrollees who have never been employed (Section II of the Questionnaire), the applicable variables for motivation and planning consist of items 11 through 27 scored separately and the sum of item weights for items 25(a) to 25(g) to form a single scale score (i.e., a "Concern for Job Characteristics" scale).

B. Questionnaire Design and Administration

The purposes of the study and the use of disadvantaged adolescent school dropouts of relatively low verbal skill levels as the respondent groups dictate the need for special attention to criterion questionnaire format, content, wording and method of presentation.

The two separate questionnaires shown in Appendices B and C were designed to deal with the two major types of outcomes under study--i.e., the more immediate, or proximal criterion variables relevant at the point of program completion and those that might serve as longer-term, or intermediate, objectives following program completion. Use of two relatively distinct sections of the Post-Program Questionnaire, however, stems from the need to obtain information about former enrollees who have never held employment and cannot, of course, be queried regarding important criterion measures that deal with job-related experiences. Indeed, for criterion development purposes--especially in devising criterion measures--

the former enrollee group that has never worked since leaving the training program is, in many ways, more like those completing the program than those who have had full-time employment experience.

Format and Content: A basic ground rule in the design of the questionnaire was that the content and format for items defining a similar criterion category would, where logical and practical, be as similar as possible. (This improves the possibilities of gross comparison between variables and criterion dimensions). Such an intention is, for practical purposes, highly limited when comparing program completion and post-program samples but is possible to a greater extent for the two subgroups of former enrollees. Even there, however, such comparisons are almost entirely limited to the categories of personal-social-family adjustment and those of vocational planning-motivation.

The first seven demographic items of each questionnaire are intended not only for identification purposes but to serve as a potential check on the interviewer's veracity in obtaining data from the respondent (i.e., the demographic information of the questionnaire should match information on an enrollee personal data form to which the interviewer would normally not have access). Questionnaire verbal level is intended to be appropriate for adolescents with relatively low verbal skills and couched in a style that allows for continuity in interviewer presentation with a "natural flow" from item to item. Thus, complete sentences are utilized throughout and the total questionnaire is designed to serve as an orally presentable "script". In line with this intent, items that cover similar subject matter and items of all coherent scales (e.g., the Vocational Adequacy Scale) are presented in sequence.

Administration: Item presentation is intended to be oral with the interviewer reading all item material to the enrollee. Marking of responses was to be done by the interviewer, preferably, but could have been carried out by the enrollee if the interviewer considered it desirable, or the enrollee requested that he be permitted to do so. Response prompting was allowed only where indicated on the questionnaire. The interviewer was to read the introductory remarks accompanying the questionnaire and obtain all of the information at a single session extending over approximately 30 to 40 minutes. As indicated in the introductory remarks, all respondents were paid for their participation.

C. Sample and Data Collection

Questionnaires were administered to a total of 379 male and female respondents. Of these, 137, who were enrolled in the NYC Out-of-School Program for at least several months, constituted a "Program Completion" criterion sample. The remaining 242 were former NYC enrollees who had been out of the program for a period of 4 months to approximately 1 1/2 years. One hundred and fifty-four of these former enrollees had full-time employment experience (Post-Program:Employment Experience Sample) and 88 had never worked full time since leaving NYC (Post-Program:No Employment Experience Sample). Full-time employment experience was defined, arbitrarily, on the basis of the ex-enrollee's having worked more than 20 hours per week for at least one week. These three subsamples are treated separately, for the most part, throughout the subsequent analyses.*

*Former enrollees who had entered the military were excluded from the study sample, since it was felt that the social adjustment and job-related outcome measures of the questionnaire were not entirely applicable to military personnel.

The 379 respondents of this cross-sectional sample were enrolled, or formerly enrolled, in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects in six (6) cities with metropolitan-area populations in excess of one-quarter million.* Three of these urban areas are in the northeastern U.S., one in the southeast, one in the mid-west and one on the west coast. These cities are indicated by letter codes and geographic locations in Table I, along with the distribution of the enrollee sample by sex and criterion group.

Six trained interviewers, who were residents of the urban area in which they conducted the interviews, were responsible for obtaining questionnaire data. All six were professionals or semi-professionals with experience in educational and training settings and none were employed by a Neighborhood Youth Corps project at the time of data collection. The NYC projects agreeing to participate, served as the basic information source for identifying present and former enrollees, their last known addresses and/or phone numbers and also provided counselor and work supervisor ratings.

The information obtained from, or about, these respondents was gathered largely during the summer of 1970, from approximately June through early October.

Special Problems

It is a truism that information availability is a primary determiner of evaluation and research capability. In that regard, certain characteristics of a youth-work training program and of the poverty-level population

---

*By agreement with various NYC regional administrative personnel and project directors, neither the specific cities nor the projects are identified.

Table I

Distribution of Sample Frequencies for N of 379

by City, Enrollee Criterion Group and Sex

City	NYC Post-Program Groups: Employment Experience	NYC Post-Program Groups: No Employment Experience	Program Completion Group	Total
A. (South)	9	21	20	50
B. (Northeast)	12	7	17	36
C. (Northeast)	29	22	28	79
D. (Northeast)	46	13	24	83
E. (Midwest)	28	11	23	62
F. (Far West)	30	14	25	69
	Total = 154 (Males = 60, Females = 94)	Total = 88 (Males = 15, Females = 73)	Total = 137 (Males = 55, Females = 82)	Total N = 379

52

served, can generate critical problems in obtaining desired criterion information and in the utility of the information obtained.

(1) Data gathering - constitutes one of the major areas of concern, since there are serious limitations in the quality of information obtainable from poverty-level, largely minority-group, adolescents who live in urban ghetto areas. Follow-up of former youth-work training program enrollees over any extended post-program period can prove particularly difficult and costly. There are usually no formal, or informal, links routinely established between the program and the enrollee once he leaves and, certainly, there is no compulsion for him to participate in data gathering efforts. Distrust and avoidance of "establishment" agencies on the part of minority group members often adds additional difficulties to problems of locating former enrollees and enlisting their cooperation.

An appreciation of many of the problems and some of the techniques for data gathering from "hard-to-locate," poverty-level, urban groups can be gleaned from a collection of papers dealing with that topic (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1969). The overall impression from those papers, and the investigators' experiences in the present study, is that one can locate a large proportion of individuals in almost any minority group or poverty-level population if there is a willingness to pay what amounts to "private detective fees." Unfortunately, such a requirement would not be likely to prove feasible for extensive and continuing research and development efforts, so that it is

often necessary to settle for less than the specified sample and a reduction in the scope of information obtainable.

Some mitigation of the problem is usually sought in greater dependence on data that do not require the enrollee's or ex-enrollee's participation (i.e., "external" sources). Both intuitively and on the basis of a need for measurement accuracy, it appears more desirable to obtain such "objective" or external, outcome information, since it can serve as criterion data in its own right as well as a check on the more "subjective" (self-report) forms of information provided by a respondent. Customary sources of external data include employment records from state agencies, job performance data, credit agency files, records of local law enforcement and welfare agencies, schools, etc; as well as evaluations, or other information from family and friends. But, this does not necessarily provide a wholly satisfactory solution since a number of the previously mentioned data gathering problems remain and new ones arise. Thus, there is not only considerable effort required to obtain information, from, say, police and welfare agency records, but the data are often of imperfect quality (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1969)--especially in terms of completeness and comparability between urban areas. In addition, ratings by employers, friends, or family can be as difficult to obtain as information directly from the former enrollee and subject to as many biases.

More serious problems are introduced, however, in terms of ethical implications and the possibility of detrimental effects resulting from the collection of data about an ex-enrollee without his knowledge and consent. The fact that some forms of desired information may be in the public domain does not entirely negate the concerns. For example, one of the most desirable forms of criterion information regarding a former enrollee is probably his record of on-the-job performance, which is only obtainable by contacting present or previous employers. Attempts to do this can arouse reasonable apprehension on the part of many respondents that any seemingly official, or quasi-official, inquiries may jeopardize their status with their employer.

There is no question being raised here regarding the value, for study purposes, of sources of criterion information external to the respondent's self-report. The present study has attempted to incorporate such forms of information where feasible within the time limitations, financial constraints and estimated accessibility, or adequacy, of the data available from various external sources. Rather, the intention is to amplify the point that the "right to privacy" is a legitimate contemporary social concern. A number of issues stemming from that concern remain to be dealt with as part of the broader spectrum of problems serving to impose serious limitations on the development and application of objectives essential to proper research and evaluation of youth-work training programs.

(2) Sampling biases - with relatively unknown effects on sample composition and findings can be imposed by both the data gathering difficulties described above and various aspects of NYC program operation. As would be the case for any post-training program follow-up study, there is the perennial difficulty of estimating whether the individuals who voluntarily participate are significantly different--in "meaningful" traits--from those who cannot be located, or choose not to serve as respondents. Demonstration of the similarity of the located, volunteer respondents to a more complete sample on the basis of available ex-post facto variables (age, sex, education, length of stay in program, etc.) does not necessarily demonstrate that selection biases failed to affect the scores on a number of post-program, dependent (criterion), variables. Selection biases of numerous sorts are still likely to produce serious undermatching, or lack of representativeness, in such attempts (Greenwood, 1945).

Since there are no reasonably complete samples available of former youth-work training enrollees measured on a sufficient number of pertinent outcomes, it remains difficult to estimate the extent of the biases introduced with any given enrollee or ex-enrollee sample obtained. The samples utilized in the present study do not, by any means, qualify as "reasonably complete." Considerably less than full participation was achieved for the respondent groups sought. For example, among these presently enrolled, the percentage of 'successes"

reported by the interviewers (i.e., respondents participating based on number of attempted contacts) was about 60% to 85% depending on the urban locale and, perhaps, equally on interviewer capability and the degree of cooperation by a given NYC project staff.

Among former enrollees, who had been out of the program for several months and more, the drop-off in those percentages is considerable since the interviewer is faced with the major problem of first locating the former enrollee. Here, the overall success rate reported was as low as 30% to 35%, although in two urban areas this was reported as somewhat better than 50%. As might have been anticipated, the interviewers reported more problems in locating those ex-enrollees who had been out of the NYC program for longer periods--particularly those who had been out for more than one year. Clearly, the greater the data gathering limitations the greater the sample biases likely to have been imposed.

One further problem in sample bias, introduced as a result of the composition of the NYC enrollee population in urban areas, is the relatively small proportion of males who either enter the program or remain enrolled for periods of several months or more. This enrollment imbalance has been characteristic of many types of youth-work training programs during the past several years and is further compounded as a biasing effect by greater difficulties--which interviewers uniformly reported--in finding male ex-enrollees and obtaining questionnaire data

from them. The female former enrollees were simply easier to locate and more willing to cooperate as respondents. Sample composition by sex is shown in Table I, where the problem of obtaining male samples of sufficient size can be seen to result, even though there were specific efforts by the interviewers to obtain a larger number of male respondents.

Despite the sampling difficulties outlined above, it is felt that the present sample can be considered suitable in terms of size, geographic distribution, and other enrollee characteristics, for purposes of this initital study aimed at identifying potential criterion variables.

D. Data Analyses

In order to examine the value of a variety of criterion measures, in the broad context required here, correlational analyses would appear to provide the maximum amount of coherent information. By determining the patterns of relationships among the variables and their underlying factors or dimensions, some bases are provided for choosing measures with the best potential for structuring given categories of outcomes.

Initially, identification of the dominant dimensions can be used (a) as a check on the extent to which the logical, a priori, criterion categories (previously specified) are empirically supportable and (b) whether other categories, not previously hypothesized, appear to be worth strengthening. A second step in utilizing the analyses would be to specify the most useful dimensions and variables for future application. The ground rules for accomplishing this are not only based on the strength of a given variable

(i.e., its loading on a dimension) but also on "rational priorities" assignable to objectives of a youth-work training program. For example, those work-related variables that are considered of especially high priority (e.g., job quality, salary, length of employment, employer rating, etc.) --where they show strong clusters--would constitute the dimensions of primary interest. Attitudinal types of variables (salary expectations, job satisfaction, etc.), that are also present on those same dimensions, in turn become stronger candidates for continued use in a criterion system. It also follows that lower priority variables, which make up relatively small isolated dimensions, are those likely to be considered as having lesser value for future use.

The basic analyses to be performed consist of computing the inter-correlation matrices for (a) 32 criterion variables chosen for use with the NYC Program Completion Sample of 137 enrollees, (b) 36 variables applied to the sample of 154 former enrollees who had full-time employment experience (Post-Program:Employment Experience Sample) and (c) a third matrix with 27 variables applicable to the sample of 88 enrollees who had never been employed full time (Post-Program:No Employment Experience Sample). Each of the 3 matrices were factor analyzed using a principal components solution (1.00's in the diagonals) with varimax rotation to orthogonality of the factors extracted (Kaiser, 1957). Missing data analyses were used throughout in computing the correlations for the matrices.

As part of the necessary examination of frequency distributions, for determining which outcome variables were suitable enough to retain in the analyses, it was also possible to make general judgments about potential sample biases for male and female subsamples and, at the same time,to

present certain descriptive findings about former enrollees that were considered worth highlighting for their programmatic implications.

III. Results and Discussion

The intercorrelations of the criterion variables and their resulting dimensions are best considered under the classifications of short-term (proximal) criteria applicable at program completion and longer term (intermediate) criteria for post-program use. Separate analyses are required in the latter group for those ex-enrollees who have had full-time employment experience and those who had never been employed full time.

Missing data occurred throughout the sample for most variables, because of one or a combination of several reasons. First, the information about the enrollee may not have been readily available. For example, employer ratings were obtainable for only 37 former enrollees in the sample of 154 since present or former employers could not be contacted; they refused to provide a rating, or the enrollee did not grant permission to contact the employer (as occurred for approximately 50% of the sample). Second, respondents may have chosen not to provide the information requested by the interviewer (e.g., an outright refusal to do so, or the belief that they did not know the answer with sufficient accuracy). For still other variables, missing data are unavoidable since the response is contingent on a previous item that can only be answered by a subsample of respondents (e.g., "Reason for leaving last job" can only include a subsample of the Post-Program Employment Experience group who had held more than one job).

Not all criterion variables that appeared in the questionnaire were found suitable for analyses. A relatively small proportion of them were

dropped because of extremely poor distribution characteristics, totally inadequate sample size, or excessive numbers of response inconsistencies that resulted from misinterpretation.

A. Program Completion Criteria

Table II presents the 32 x 32 intercorrelation matrix obtained from the NYC Program Completion group.* Significant correlations, indicated in the table by asterisks, are found to be uniformly low to moderate in size with approximately 13% of those significant correlations reaching the .05 confidence level, or better.

Certain of the individual correlations stand out as reference points worth noting as indicative of overall response consistency (reliability) within the questionnaire. The most striking of these relationships is the r of .79 between the enrollee's questionnaire response to the amount of trouble experienced with the police and the actual occurrence of police contacts (Variables #20 and #28). At that level of relationship the enrollee's self-report of trouble with the police might, in essence, serve as a reasonable substitute for the actual occurrence of police contacts especially where the latter is too difficult or costly to obtain. On the basis of this correlation it could also be assumed that the enrollee's

---

*In order to assist the reader in associating the variables analyzed in the matrices with the questionnaire items from which they were obtained, the numbered variables for each of the three respondent groups are listed in Appendix A with the associated questionnaire item number.

Table II

Intercorrelation Matrix[1]

Program Completion Criteria

(N = 137)[2]

	1 Vocational Adequacy	2 Quality of Job Desired	3 Reason for Selecting Job (Irrel./Rel.)	4 Awareness of Job Characteristics	5 Knowledge of Job Selected	6 Ability to Do Job	7 Starting Salary Expected	8 Highest Salary Expected	9 Ways to Look for 1st Job	10 Important Things to Ask Job Interviewer	11 Job Search Plans (Suitability)	12 Long Range Plans (Job Quality)	13 Ability to Accomplish Plans	14 Get Along with Family	15 Family Feelings about Enrollee	16 Financial Assistance to Family	17 Save Money	18 # People Giving Hard Time	19 Health Problems (No/Yes)	20 Amt. Trouble with Police	21 Try to Keep Out of Trouble	22 # Jobs Chosen for Training	23 Willingness to Train Full Time	24 Willingness to Train Part Time	25 Job Motivation Scale	26 Counselor Rating	27 Work Supervisor Rating	28 Actual Police Contacts (No/Yes)	29 # Work Site Assignments	30 # Work Site Absences	31 Peer Rating Score	32 # Times Chosen for Rating
1		14	05	18*	01	04	11	24*	-08	02	04	11	10	-14	-13	-03	-06	-13	-06	07	-03	-07	-13	-19*	07	17	10	16	03	-03	02	14
2			22*	-06	06	-01	25*	24*	-12	09	18*	22*	05	11	-03	-09	04	04	15	-06	06	06	-19*	-06	09	04	09	10	-18	-05	-10	07
3				-02	09	26*	-07	09	07	05	-09	03	-14	-09	-17	01	16	04	-13	03	13	08	06	10	11	-01	03	04	11	-09	05	09
4					01	12	-06	-07	-02	17*	-03	02	-06	-05	-01	05	-06	-06	-06	-13	06	07	-04	01	-02	03	09	-23*	09	-10	21*	19
5						45*	11	09	11	-02	08	24	10	05	-04	07	-09	08	05	11	03	-11	01	14	03	-19	04	17	-06	09	-14	03
6							-11	-20*	15	04	10	06	-05	-01	18*	-06	11	12	-08	-07	11	13	-15	04	00	07	18	-03	12	-01	06	10
7								64*	-12	02	01	15	24*	-07	10	-04	-17	25*	26*	12	-05	-17	-10	-06	17	-16	-15	13	-13	06	-09	17
8									-17	-16	-12	31*	22	-17	-13	07	-14	32*	16	27*	-05	-48*	-02	05	09	-20	-16	35*	-03	02	-27*	13
9										05	09	02	02	02	-07	04	-10	27*	-20*	-06	-10	03	-03	-03	-28*	07	17	-14	-15	-11	02	03
10											10	01	07	11	02	04	06	-12	-10	-25*	-18*	09	-02	03	11	18	15	-08	14	-04	15	-03
11												10	06	-08	03	00	-01	-04	-08	-00	-12	06	-10	-05	-13	-21	-15	15	-11	17	-10	-06
12													29*	00	-01	-04	03	03	04	09	08	-11	-11	04	10	03	09	06	13	-11	-11	03
13														17	-18	07	-10	-26*	-03	-18	06	-05	11	18	18	00	02	-11	-05	-02	02	13
14															17	04	-05	-28*	-07	-07	-05	-06	02	06	06	05	-06	-18	-13	-17	26*	-12
15																-13	-03	14	-02	-00	02	12	-30*	-12	01	07	02	-03	09	11	09	-02
16																	-02	06	-03	02	06	-17	19*	13	-14	06	06	-05	-07	-09	-02	10
17																		03	-03	-23*	11	14	-11	-08	00	16	11	-13	35*	04	-03	-15
18																			14	26*	01	-03	-09	-06	-14	-03	11	39*	-05	29*	-17	15
19																				06	-02	05	12	06	04	-20	-02	16	-03	16	-25*	04
20																					-18*	-29*	14	03	19*	-18	-28*	79*	-07	31*	-15	24*
21																						12	02	20*	18*	09	16	-10	13	08	12	10
22																							-17*	-06	-06	23*	24*	-21*	03	-26*	-01	-03
23																								31*	-01	-16	00	14	-08	-01	08	11
24																									16	-13	-06	24	03	13	16	01
25																										-04	-04	11	09	10	-09	03
26																											40*	-17	-01	-30*	02	18
27																												-15	-03	-32*	11	-11
28																													-07	31*	-26*	20
29																														21	-01	-18
30																															-12	03
31																																09
32																																

[1]Decimal points omitted

[2]Missing data occurred throughout the matrix: N's range from approximately 65 to 137.

*r significant at .05 confidence level or better

willingness to provide an accurate response, for such a supposedly "sensitive" form of information, would spread to overall response accuracy for other questionnaire items.*

Another correlation that reflects a degree of questionnaire internal consistency is the substantial r of .64 between the "starting salary" expected on the first job and the "highest salary" that the enrollee expects to achieve on that same job (Variables #7 and #8). High correlations between variables that should logically be related (e.g., different questions about salary expectations) help to confirm response consistency. Similarly, it can be noted that no clear instances occur among the significant correlations in the matrix that would constitute illogical relationships or lead to suspicions of response inconsistency.

An additional relationship of note is found between Counselor Ratings and Work Supervisor Ratings (Variables #26 and #27). The correlation of .40 obtained here is very similar to one of .36 previously obtained for such raters evaluating NYC enrollees some two years prior to collection of the present data (Freeberg, 1970). Thus, a degree of confidence can be placed in the stability of those two important external criterion measures. It is, however, the pattern of relationships and the criterion clusters, or dimensions, formed that best summarize the information of interest in the matrix and provide some basis for choosing the most usable outcome measures.

Criterion dimensions. Seven factors, accounting for 47% of the total variance, were extracted from the 32 x 32 matrix of Program Completion

---

*Interviewers were not to ask permission to check police records nor to inform the enrollee that they intended to do so.

criterion measures. The choice of seven factors for rotation was based on a decision to deal with one more than the approximate number of criterion categories hypothesized (i.e., those six having been: Vocational Planning, Feelings of Vocational Adequacy, Family-Personal Adjustment, Community Adjustment, Training Program Performance and Work Motivation). Five of the seven factors were found to be sufficiently interpretable and to have value as broad outcome dimensions. Loadings, on the five rotated factors interpreted, are presented in Appendix G. These five factors are discussed below along with a listing of the variables that possessed loadings of adequate size to enter into the factor interpretation (loadings of .30 or higher).

Two of these factors that are relatively dominant, based on accountable variance, deal with somewhat distinct forms of adjustment that are designated as Training Program Adjustment (Factor I) and Social-Community Adjustment (Factor II).

Factor I

Training Program Adjustment

Variable		Loading
20	Amount of Trouble with Police	.66
27	Work Supervisor Ratings	-.64
30	Number of Work Site Absences	.61
26	Counselor Rating	-.57
28	Actual Police Contacts	.54
22	Number of Jobs Chosen for Training	-.49
17	Save Money	-.31
9	Ways to Look for First Job	-.30

Factor II

Social Adjustment

Variable		Loading
18	Number of People Giving Enrollee Hard Time	.71
14	Get Along with Family	-.60
28	Actual Police Contacts	.56
13	Ability to Accomplish Plans	-.47
20	Amount of Trouble with Police	.47
31	Peer Rating Score	-.41

The first factor defines a relatively broad aspect of adjustment, after some period of NYC enrollment, that is concerned largely with performance in the program but also possesses a major component of outside adjustment in the form of problems with police. Thus, the primary loadings of this bipolar dimension present a pattern of lower work supervisor and counselor ratings accompanied by more work-site absences and more trouble with the police (admitted by the enrollee and actual). It also incorporates tendencies by the enrollee to indicate fewer jobs as acceptable for training, when a number of choices are presented, a lesser likelihood that he saves money from his NYC pay and poorer knowledge of relevant ways to search for a job that he would desire.

Factor II is more clearly one of Social-Community Adjustment, primarily outside of the work-training program, with the enrollee perceiving more people in the community as giving him a "hard time," having more trouble with his family, as well as with the police, and also being rated lower in overall adjustment by his fellow enrollees. As in the previous factor, there is a tendency for the maladjusted enrollee to show up as poorer on some aspect of vocational planning. In this case he tends to indicate fewer relevant ways for accomplishing his stated vocational plans.

A third relatively clear and dominant dimension that emerges is definable as Job Aspiration Level (Factor III) and is based almost entirely on the enrollee's vocational expectations and assessment of his capabilities.

Factor III

Job Aspiration Level

Variable		Loading
8	Highest Salary Expected	.73
7	Starting Salary Expected	.69
2	Quality of Job Desired	.58
12	Long Range Job Plans	.56
13	Ability to Accomplish Plans	.47
1	Vocational Adequacy Scale	.38
25	Job Motivation Scale	.30

The higher expectations of this enrollee cut uniformly across salary expectations, the quality of the job he desires when he leaves NYC, the level of job he plans to obtain over the long run and the relevance of his stated plans for achieving his goals. As is logical, the factor also incorporates stronger feelings of vocational adequacy and a higher degree of job motivation in the face of obstacles.

Somewhat close to this third factor conceptually, but empirically distinct, is the rather minor factor designated as Planning Competency (Factor V). This fairly clear dimension is indicative of the individual who would choose a job for which he feels he has adequate knowledge and ability, and who demonstrates competence in knowing how to look for the job he wants.

Factor V

Planning Competency

Variable		Loading
6	Ability to Do Job Sought	.72
5	Knowledge of Job Sought	.72
9	Ways to Look for First Job	.44
11	Job Search Plans (Suitability)	.35

The coherence of the factor, despite its relative specificity, makes it appear worth expanding for future criterion development efforts by use of additional similar items and scales that demonstrate specific vocational planning skills.

The final interpretable factor (IV), although not as readily designated as the others, seems to identify the enrollee who possesses (and projects) a Self-Confident Image.

Factor IV

Self-Confident Image

Variable		Loading
32	Number of Times Chosen for Rating	.60
31	Peer Rating Score	.49
4	Awareness of Job Characteristics	.47
26	Counselor Rating	.41
1	Vocational Adequacy	.40
19	Health Problems	-.38
11	Job Search Plans	-.32

He is better known by his peers (i.e., selected more frequently for rating) and rated higher by them, as well as by the guidance counselor. In addition, he tends to show more interest in the characteristics of any job he would seek; to be confident of his vocational adequacy (ability to

obtain and hold a job) when he leaves NYC and to see himself as being in good health. Interestingly, however, he tends to show poorer planning skill if he should be faced with loss of the first job after NYC. For this reason and the fact that the work supervisor is the only rater not influenced by him in a positive way (i.e., no interpretable positive loading for on-the-job proficiency ratings), there is some suspicion that the concept of "image" appropriately enters into the designation of the factor.

It should be evident that effective potential criteria for defining enrollee "success," after a period of program participation, could be derived from a number of these different dimensions--several of which bear a degree of similarity to hypothesized categories of outcome (e.g., Training Program Adjustment, Social Development). Such empirically defined dimensions should also be stable enough to lend themselves to the formulation of new criterion variables that can be used to broaden their applicability. On the basis of the present evidence, where variables are needed for particular, immediate uses (e.g., test validation or construction of the most effective scales as composite criteria), the end-of-program objectives of the sort likely to be most effective can be defined as:

1. Objective-External Data (sources other than enrollee self-report)
   - Work supervisor and guidance counselor evaluations
   - Trainee absences during enrollment in the program
   - Difficulties experienced with law enforcement agencies
   - Evaluations by peers

2. Enrollee Provided Data (objectively verifiable)

   . Assessment of problems with law enforcement agencies

   . Monetary planning (e.g., savings)

   . Appropriateness of job decisions and job choices (i.e., planning) for the immediate and longer term

3. Enrollee Provided Data (attitudinal; not objectively verifiable)

   . Feelings about family (acceptance; cooperativeness)

   . Perceived problems with members of the community

   . Feelings of adequacy or "readiness" for employment

   . Assessment of personal capabilities with regard to future job performance

B. Post-Program Criteria (Enrollees with full-time employment experience)

Thirty-six (36) variables, covering outcome measures for the group of former enrollees who have held full-time employment, were intercorrelated and are presented in the matrix shown in Table III. These longer-term (intermediate) criteria that incorporate a number of the important work-related performance outcomes result in a matrix that yields the largest proportion of significant correlations (approximately 22% of the 630 r's) and a more clearly definable set of factors than the other two criterion groups under study.

Evidence for overall internal consistency in enrollee response to questionnaire items is demonstrated again, as for the Program Completion data, in the high correlation of .83 between "amount of trouble with the police" reported by the enrollee (Variable #30) and "actual police contacts" (Variable #36). In addition, high levels of correlation that are logically expected and indicative of response consistency are seen in the substantial r of .74 between the "number of job applications filed" (Variable #13) and

Table III

Intercorrelation Matrix[1]

Post-Program Criteria

(Enrollees with Full-Time Employment Experience)

(N = 154)[2]

	# Interviewer Contacts Required	# Places Lived	Employed Now (No/Yes)	Job Category of Industry (White/Blue Collar)	Job Quality: Level	Hrs. Worked per Wk.	Length of Stay on Job	# Jobs Held Since N.Y.C.	Reason Left Job (Poor/Good)	Time to Find 1st Job	# Sources Used for 1st Job	# Places Interviewed	# Applications Filed	Met Job Expectations	Starting Salary	# Raises	Amount 1st Raise	Promotion (No/Yes)	Job Satisfaction	Level of Short Term Plans	Job Quality Sought (Short Term)	Level of Long Term Plans	Get Along with Family	Family Feelings about Enrollee	Financial Assistance to Family	# People Giving Hard Time	Health Problems (No/Yes)	# Times Visited Doctor	Save Money	Amt. Trouble with Police	Credit Buying (No/Yes)	Ease of Obtaining Credit	# Visits to USES	Permission for Employer (Rating (No/Yes)	Employer Rating	Actual Police Contacts (No/Yes)
1		00	07	04	-04	04	09	08	00	-05	11	16*	26*	10	08	-01	-15	-10	10	-13	-08	-06	08	03	02	-19*	06	-04	-09	-07	02	-01	07	-19*	-32*	-12
2			-05	08	05	07	05	32*	04	-06	08	16*	21*	10	16*	-04	-02	14	04	04	17*	03	-06	-00	16	12	-06	16*	-02	12	07	12	23*	28*	-31	09
3				-17*	07	-05	37*	-03	17	-01	-03	02	-02	27*	13	08	-08	18*	07	03	-09	-04	15	51*	08	-07	04	-00	36*	-23*	-02	24	-30*	27*	66*	-23*
4					11	13	-01	15	01	-14	-04	17*	11	-04	13	-16	-09	-02	-03	00	04	-14	07	-12	09	-04	-05	05	-08	09	-05	02	05	-13	-36*	26*
5						12	14	02	03	-17*	-00	-03	-12	20*	29*	14	41*	20*	17*	04	18*	-04	02	13	-04	04	-18*	-01	08	00	14	17	04	13	08	-05
6							08	04	-06	-19*	06	02	-03	08	24*	09	-08	05	15	-14	-03	-14	06	04	01	-11	10	11	-04	-10	-08	-15	-11	-10	14	13
7								-26*	-17	-39*	-03	-22*	-15	28*	22*	16	12	27*	31*	-06	-10	-11	00	32*	11	-07	05	10	23*	-11	03	13	-26*	10	38*	-17
8									-28	01	06	28*	32*	-07	08	16	01	02	-05	01	-03	-05	-02	-09	09	08	-12	-06	-06	20*	09	13	26*	10	-41*	33*
9										-11	24	08	12	-03	-02	03	-18	-07	-11	23	28	09	30*	06	01	00	-09	-12	24	-22	00	-07	01	-02	21	-24
10											12	20*	21*	-06	-06	-24*	06	-09	-14	01	03	09	-11	-22*	-11	14	05	-07	-05	11	-09	06	13	02	-04	01
11												19*	22*	-15	04	08	-07	-08	01	-03	-09	-18*	-09	-08	-16*	-01	-06	-14	-03	08	04	11	05	-16	06	08
12													74*	-16*	08	17	-16	-00	-23*	-05	05	-04	-10	-02	-08	23*	06	-10	02	19*	03	08	24*	09	-20	24*
13														-11	-05	24*	00	01	-17*	-07	11	00	-03	-09	-08	14	02	-13	05	12	00	13	31*	06	-23	12
14															22*	01	19	16*	50*	-13	-02	-01	08	40*	03	-13	-01	15	19*	-04	14	14	-18*	-2*	03	-29*
15																10	12	23*	31*	-09	-12	-20*	04	24*	-02	09	01	18*	16*	06	-11	19*	01	10	-08	-01
16																	14	34*	09	03	07	-09	23	10	06	-11	06	-10	25*	01	14	21	00	06	09	07
17																		30*	25*	12	13	-07	-06	-10	01	11	05	-02	00	00	-09	25	-06	22	09	00
18																			06	10	18*	-01	09	-*	16*	27*	01	19*	20*	02	-01	23*	01	24*	28	-11
19																				-08	-03	-13	13	26*	10	-12	-10	-00	18*	-08	06	-01	-07	12	-12	-14
20																					16	09	-07	-06	-04	-01	-03	01	14	-14	03	15	-05	02	31*	-15
21																						30*	19*	-01	11	20*	07	07	-02	01	12	25*	05	15	23	-03
22																							-01	02	18*	02	-07	-08	09	-02	07	07	10	19*	01	-03
23																								27*	19*	-33*	-03	02	19*	-14	-15	15	-03	-05	08	-12
24																									15	-12	-01	05	30*	-33*	-06	19	-16*	23*	38*	-31*
25																										-14	10	17*	06	-25*	-11	28*	-06	05	10	-17
26																											-02	04	-13	36*	01	-22	23*	20*	22	19
27																												28*	-05	-27*	-26*	-10	-05	-22*	23	-15
28																													-10	-09	10	09	03	12	08	-17
29																														-18*	05	25*	-14	19*	40*	-18
30																															22*	-28*	-14	12	-36*	83*
31																																19	01	24*	-31*	-05
32																																	00	09	01	-30*
33																																		-05	-51*	14
34																																			-15	00
35																																				-35
36																																				

[1]Decimal points omitted

[2]Missing data occurred thoughout the matrix: N's range from approximately 37 to 154.

*r significant at .05 confidence level or better

"number of places interviewed" (Variable #13) and in the r of .50 between the "Job Satisfaction" score (Variable #19) and the enrollee's assessment of the extent to which he has "met job expectations" since leaving NYC (Variable #14).

Again, for this matrix as, for the previous one, there are no significant correlations that are illogical in their interpretation and no reason to suspect general response inconsistency for the questionnaire.

Criterion dimensions. Seven factors accounting for 50% of the variance in the 36 x 36 matrix were extracted and rotated to orthogonality by the methods already indicated. These were found to represent, adequately, the dominant dimensions of the matrix with six of the seven factors considered sufficiently interpretable to be utilized for defining criterion constructs (Appendix G). Those six possess an overall, although limited, correspondence between their designations and the logically derived post-program criterion categories hypothesized previously in Section II. Thus, Factor I, General Job Success and Adjustment, appearing as the dominant factor--with the largest variance accounted for and the greatest number of factor loadings at levels of .30 or greater--is concerned with overall adjustment that has a distinctly vocational focus.

Factor I

General Job Success and Adjustment

Variable		Loading
3	Employed Now (No/Yes)	.80
24	Family Feelings about Enrollee	.68
35	Employer Rating	.59
29	Save Money	.57
7	Length of Stay on Job	.52
14	Met Job Expectations	.48
36	Police Contacts (Actual)	-.45
4	Industry Category (White/Blue Collar)	-.36
33	Number of Visits to SES	-.35
30	Amount of Trouble with Police	-.32
34	Permission for Employer Rating	.30
18	Job Promotion (No/Yes)	.30
19	Job Satisfaction	.30

The factor can be seen to characterize the enrollee with full-time employment experience who is also currently employed at the time of the interview. He receives a distinctly higher employer rating, has stayed on his job longer, has been more likely to get promoted on that job, be more satisfied with it and, in addition, feel that he has come closer to meeting his job expectations. He is also more likely to be employed in a white-collar industrial setting and to give permission to obtain an evaluation from his employer. In addition to those aspects of vocational success, these performance outcomes define an individual who sees his family's opinion of himself as a favorable one, saves money regularly, has less trouble with the police and is less likely to utilize the State Employment Service (undoubtedly because he is less likely to need its services). In essence, then, a major dimension useful for defining post-program success should be conceived of as more than one dealing with job performance alone, important

as that remains, but as one that incorporates other community and personal adjustment behaviors as well.

Where a more narrowly defined job performance scale is desired, the variables of Factor II, Striving for Vocational Success, form a dimension that should be considered.

Factor II

Striving for Vocational Success

Variable		Loading
18	Job Promotion (No/Yes)	.61
26	Number of People Giving Enrollee Hard Time	.58
17	Amount of First Raise	.55
1	Number of Interviewer Contacts	-.52
21	Job Quality Sought	.46
34	Permission for Employer Rating	.40
5	Job Quality	.38
35	Employer Rating	.34

The positive enrollee attributes for this dimension are defined on the basis of more job promotions and salary raises, a higher quality of employment obtained and a higher employer rating of job proficiency. But there are variables external to the job per se, that also add to a description of the former enrollee who is striving for job success. Thus, he was found to be more difficult to contact for an interview and he also saw more people as "giving him a hard time" at work and in the community. (Perhaps, not an unexpected perception for a poverty level individual who is trying to get ahead, vocationally, and having some success in accomplishing that goal.)

Similarly job-specific in its pattern of loadings is Factor III, Job Stability-Mobility, which defines a pattern of enrollee job behaviors that

entail the filing of more applications before obtaining the first post-program job and, correspondingly, having had more job interviews. In addition, there have been more visits to USTES--probably resulting from a greater need for its services--along with greater mobility vocationally ("more jobs held since leaving NYC") and geographically (lived in more places). This general mobility and "job hopping" can be seen to carry a negative connotation for a sample of disadvantaged young adults, since the enrollee also tends to be rated lower in job proficiency by his employer.

Factor III

Job Stability-Mobility

Variable		Loading
13	Number of Applications Filed	.82
12	Number of Places Interviewed	.80
8	Number of Jobs Held Since NYC	.57
33	Number of Visits to USES	.49
2	Number of Places Lived	.46
35	Employer Rating	-.40

If Factor I could be viewed as defining overall job success and adjustment for those whose present employment tends to be in white-collar work settings, then Factor IV can best be interpreted as one of general vocational adjustment for those former enrollees whose employment experience has been primarily in blue-collar industry.

Factor IV

Blue-Collar Job Success

Variable		Loading
10	Time to Find First Job	-.56
6	Hours Worked Per Week	.54
15	Starting Salary	.47
22	Level of Long-Term Plans	-.42
4	Industry Category (White/Blue Collar)	.41
16	Number of Salary Raises	.41
5	Job Quality	.40
19	Job Satisfaction	.38
23	Get Along with Family	.35
7	Length of Stay on Job	.35

The pattern of loadings for this factor of Blue-Collar Job Success depicts the former enrollee who found his first job after NYC more quickly, worked more hours per week, received a higher starting salary and more raises, in a better quality job at which he tended to remain employed longer and with which he expressed greater job satisfaction. However, this successful job performance pattern is also marked by poorer long-term job planning.* The only social adjustment variable loading on the factor is at a modest level (.35), indicating that positive feelings about getting along with the family play a role in defining success for a blue-collar worker.

Within the realm of personal social adjustment, there are two dimensions that define relatively independent areas of outcomes. One is limited almost exclusively to a Community-Family Adjustment pattern (Factor V) and the other

---

*The result may be largely artifactual since the future plans of the successful blue-collar employee might lead him to continue doing what he has been doing successfully. Such a response on the questionnaire was scored toward the lower end of a four point scale. Higher scores were assigned to responses that involve looking for a higher level job or going to school, which responses are probably more typical of white-collar employees.

depicts a form of adjustment that is essentially vocational--i.e., Vocational Adjustment and Satisfaction (Factor VI).

Factor V

Community and Family Adjustment

Variable		Loading
25	Financial Assistance to Family	.61
30	Amount of Trouble with Police	-.60
36	Actual Police Contacts	-.59
32	Ease of Obtaining Credit	.48
28	Number of Times Visited Doctor	.45
26	No. of People Giving Enrollee Hard Time	-.34
11	Number of Sources Used for First Job	-.34
23	Getting Along with Family	.32
21	Job Quality Sought (Long Term)	.32

Factor VI

Vocational Adjustment- Dissatisfaction

Variable		Loading
9	Reason Left Job (Poor/Good)	.68
20	Level of Short-Term Plans	.42
21	Quality of Job Sought	.42
23	Get Along with Family	.39
35	Employer Rating	.37
28	Number of Times Visited Doctor	-.36
14	Met Job Expectations	-.35
29	Save Money	.33
16	Number of Raises	.32
19	Job Satisfaction	-.30

Factor V can be seen to load positively on family items that deal with providing financial assistance and getting along with the family in general. As part of this pattern, there is better community adjustment in the form of

less trouble with the police, being able to obtain credit more easily and feelings of fewer people giving him a hard time in the community or at work. This same ex-enrollee also tends to have seen a physician more frequently since leaving the NYC program, a practice which, among poverty level groups, appears to be associated with positive attitudes and social adjustment. (This represents a reversal of the role of this criterion variable usually found for middle-class and military populations.) Furthermore, in obtaining the first job the adjusted enrollee requires the assistance of fewer institutional or community sources and tends to choose a job of higher quality that he would seek over the longer term.

Although the positive pattern of loadings on Factor VI (Vocational Adjustment-Dissatisfaction) are indicative of a form of job success, the interpretation of its accompanying negative loadings contain an element of obvious job dissatisfaction. Thus, the factor defines an ex-enrollee who presents good reasons for having left any job, and of having been an employee who obtained more raises and was also rated higher in proficiency by his employer. His short-term planning skills are superior as are his desires for a higher quality job for the future. Some non-vocational forms of adjustment are seen in his claim of getting along with his family and of saving regularly. However, as part of the pattern, this former enrollee does not feel that he has met the job expectations that he had when he left the NYC program and he also tends to be more dissatisfied with his job. Interestingly, in light of its loading on the previous factor, the measure "frequency of physician visits" loads negatively here (i.e., less likelihood of visiting a physician) and may be seen as consistent with the dissatisfaction or maladjustment aspect of this dimension.

On the basis of the above analysis, optimum variables for potential use in constructing a set of post-program objectives should be drawn from:

1. Objective-External Data (sources other than enrollee self-report)
   - . Rating of proficiency by present or former employers
   - . Difficulties experienced with law enforcement agencies
   - . Ease with which contacted for an interview
2. Enrollee Provided Data (objectively verifiable)
   - . Geographic mobility
   - . Utilization of USTES
   - . Current employment status and type of job
   - . Ease of obtaining employment (time to obtain employment; number of attempts required)
   - . Assessment of problems with law enforcement agencies
   - . Salary level (present and past jobs)
   - . Job performance (promotions and raises)
   - . Job stability (number of jobs and length of job stay)
   - . Monetary behavior (savings and use of credit)
3. Enrollee Provided Data (attitudinal: not objectively verifiable)
   - . Job related feelings of personal satisfaction
   - . Perceptions of family role
   - . Perceived problems in community and at work
   - . Level of job plans and expectations

As a tentative look at possible equivalence between criterion dimensions for the short-term program completion outcomes and those of the longer-term post-program period, it is possible to compare the two sets of factors by gross visual inspection. Granted the caution that the two matrices have

only a minor portion of their variables in common and utilize different members for these cross-sectionally obtained samples, it is of interest to note a degree of similarity in the dominant "success" factors found for the two samples. Each success factor was heavily loaded on similar job performance variables (e.g., ratings by work supervisors for one group and by employers for the other), accompanied by similar adjustment variables (e.g., police contacts, saving of money). In addition broad similarity could be inferred from the major "adjustment" factor of each sample with regard to loadings on variables of police contacts, difficulties with people in the community and the extent to which the enrollees were getting along with their family. Further, but somewhat more speculatively, a form of dimensional equivalence might be assumed for the "aspirational" grouping found with presently enrolled trainees, and the "striving for vocational success" behavior pattern that marks those who have left the program and achieved a measure of job success.

In any event, such contrasts must remain pure conjecture until they can be confirmed by direct measurement of criterion equivalence over time, feasible only with a longitudinal study sample.

C. Post-Program Criteria (Enrollees with no full-time employment experience)

Results achieved by the analysis of outcome variables for a post-program enrollee group, that had not worked full time since leaving the training program, should be viewed as fairly limited in their applicability. Not only is the available sample size relatively small (N = 88), but it is a sample composed primarily of female former enrollees. Males who had remained unemployed for months or years after leaving NYC were exceptionally difficult to locate and interview. In addition, the nature of the outcome variables potentially applicable to such a group are narrow in their scope

and degree of objectivity. On a purely rational basis, it is difficult to define specific outcomes for a group that has never held full-time jobs. As indicated previously, criteria for such a sample bear a greater resemblance to outcome measures applicable to a currently enrolled (program completion) group than to a post-program group with employment experience. In addition they lack even the external evaluative possibilities offered by counselor, work supervisor and peer ratings reasonably obtainable for a currently enrolled group.

One alternative is to eliminate this post-program group as inappropriate for outcome measurement once they are identified as not having had any post-program employment experience (i.e., that they have simply "failed" to achieve measurable benefit from the program). Such an alternative has, in effect, been rejected for this study on the basis of arguments against use of a single outcome variable as the sole evaluative standard. It also seems somewhat impractical to assume, without further evidence, that no beneficial effects of program participation accrued to such a large proportion of a former enrollee population or that any possible benefits derived are not worth the measurement attempts. Thus, at this stage of the criterion development process, it is seen as valuable to consider the 27 potential outcome variables available for analyses with this post-program sample.

The 27 x 27 intercorrelation matrix of Table IV contains a number of significant correlations that can be pointed to as reflecting a degree of internal consistency for the questionnaire responses. For example, the correlation of similar magnitude ($r = .79$) is, again, found between the enrollee report of amount of trouble with the police (Variable #23) and interviewer data on actual police contacts (Variable #27). Logical, internal consistency

Table IV

Intercorrelation Matrix[1]

Post-Program Criteria

(Enrollees with No Full-Time Employment Experience)

(N = 88)[2]

	1 # Interviewer Contacts Required	2 # Places Lived	3 Level of Current Activity	4 Level of Short Term Plans	5 Part Time Work (No/Yes)	6 Job Quality Level Sought	7 Reason Picked Job Sought (Irrel./Rel.)	8 Knowledge of Job Sought	9 Ability to Do Job Sought	10 Reason for Ability (Irrel./Rel.)	11 Starting Salary Expected	12 Highest Salary Expected	13 Ways to Look For Job	14 Things to Ask About Job	15 Concern for Job Characteristics	16 Long Range Work Plans	17 Means to Achieve Plans	18 Get Along with Family	19 Future Financial Contribution to Family	20 # People Giving Hard Time	21 Health Problems (No/Yes)	22 # Times Seen Doctor	23 Amt. Trouble with Police	24 Credit Buying (No/Yes)	25 Ease of Obtaining Credit	26 Visits to USES	27 Actual Police Contacts (No/Yes)
1		-23*	02	-17	21	-15	-13	-15	-10	-12	07	-19	04	-05	-16	-05	14	-16	-08	14	-13	-03	03	15	-10	-04	10
2			02	-09	06	-06	-10	19	34*	-30*	-23	-35*	03	-16	-09	-28*	-44*	10	49*	-11	11	07	-07	-05	16	05	03
3				40*	18	23*	07	02	-00	28	15	-00	-08	06	34*	07	01	21	-14	-15	00	21	-14	-03	13	-05	-02
4					-02	40*	10	11	01	25	13	-06	07	-13	28*	32*	21	22*	-09	04	30*	-02	-08	02	14	15	-04
5						-06	01	-11	12	09	35*	25	-00	-20	-00	-11	-05	20	02	-03	-07	-04	-04	-11	10	08	08
6							-01	-03	-21	08	15	07	-08	-06	30*	42*	10	23*	08	04	-01	-10	-35*	15	16	04	-27*
7								-01	-10	79*	16	11	27*	01	22	02	-04	-03	19	-25	-15	02	05	-28*	05	-10	05
8									48*	-01	-34*	-34*	-02	10	03	07	-14	29*	13	-06	-01	30*	01	07	20	-04	-05
9										-07	-33*	-54*	-08	03	-11	-23	-23	18	33*	01	14	16	-03	-10	12	06	11
10											09	03	25	-09	52*	-03	01	08	00	-23	-20	01	03	-37*	02	-10	04
11												46*	04	07	-01	23	15	11	-17	-15	-05	-11	29*	02	-04	-07	24
12													02	18	01	11	14	-13	-40*	02	-13	-35*	20	-17	-37*	26	21
13														-15	-02	-07	-06	-19	09	-25	13	03	-10	-28*	20	04	-07
14															-04	19	13	01	-12	09	07	12	07	11	13	-21	05
15																-04	-25	18	-09	-17	14	16	-21*	05	35*	06	-24*
16																	65*	31*	-19	-01	-08	-09	-11	14	01	01	-16
17																		21	-22	-25	-01	04	-08	-05	-02	00	-09
18																			14	-27*	02	07	-18	07	28*	03	-22
19																				-17	12	24	-24*	01	53*	-02	-28*
20																					02	08	15	15	-32*	-04	04
21																						04	-05	06	26*	-03	-09
22																							-21	06	23	-01	-27*
23																								-07	-30*	-15	79*
24																									21	13	-08
25																										-06	-27
26																											-18
27																											

[1] Decimal points omitted

[2] *Missing data occurred throughout the matrix: N's range from approximately 30 to 88.

*r significant at .05 confidence level or better

81

can be inferred from what should be, and is, a high correlation (r = .79) between the relevance of reasons given for picking a job that is sought (Variable #7) and the relevance of reasons given for having the ability to perform that job (Variable #10). Similarly, there is a degree of consistency shown by the r of .65 between the level of long range work plans (Variable #16) and the level of response appropriateness regarding the means to achieve those plans (Variable #17). The one inconsistency found among the significant correlations is the r of -.23 between "number of places lived" (Variable #2) and "number of interviewer contacts required" (Variable #1). Its contribution to the factor patterns will be seen below to offer little clarification for the unusual result.

Criterion dimensions. Seven factors were extracted from the intercorrelation matrix, as in the two previous analyses, and rotated by the same procedure. The seven factors accounted for 50% of the total variance with only four of these considered interpretable and possessing loadings of sufficient number and magnitude to warrant discussion of their potential value (see Appendix G). As might have been anticipated for this sample, with relatively few criterion categories that can be hypothesized (i.e., primarily categories of motivation, planning and adjustment), there were correspondingly few usable factors and even those were found to be relatively weak and difficult to interpret.

Two of the dimensions deal with forms of adjustment, one being concerned primarily with adjustment in the community and the other taking the form of a desire for personal improvement.

Factor I

Community Adjustment

Variable		Loading
27	Actual Police Contacts	-.85
23	Amount of Trouble with Police	-.84
25	Ease of Obtaining Credit	.52
19	Future Financial Contribution to Family	.46
12	Highest Salary Expected	-.36
22	Number of Times Visited a Doctor	.35

Factor II

Striving for Personal Improvement

Variable		Loading
5	Part-Time Work Experience (No/Yes)	.81
11	Starting Salary Expected	.59
1	Number of Interviewer Contacts Required	.39
3	Level of Current Activity	.31
18	Get Along with Family	.30
20	Number of People Giving Enrollee Hard Time	-.30

Factor I, Community Adjustment, describes a pattern of outcomes for an enrollee who has fewer problems with the police, claims more ready access to credit, a willingness to make a greater financial contribution to family income (if he should be employed in the future), an expectation of a lesser starting salary and a tendency to visit a doctor more frequently since leaving the program (the latter result being consonant with the previous finding that the variable loads positively on an adjustment dimension.)

Factor II, Striving for Personal Improvement, has a factor pattern more indicative of personal adjustment that describes the enrollee who has held part-time employment and, probably as a result, expects a higher starting salary on the first full-time job. He also tends to be engaged in a form of

higher level activity at the time of the interview (i.e., "in school" or "in another work training program" as opposed to "still job hunting" or "not working; not looking"), to be getting along better with his family and to perceive fewer people in the community as giving him a "hard time."

Factor III can be interpreted, tentatively, as an aspiration or confidence dimension, with aspirations tempered by "reality" of expectation.

Factor III

Realistic Aspirations

Variable		Loading
9	Ability to Do Job Sought	.77
2	Number of Places Lived	.66
8	Knowledge of Job Sought	.64
12	Highest Salary Expected	-.59
19	Futur Financial Contacts to Family	.55
18	Get Along with Family	.43
25	Ease of Obtaining Credit	.41
11	Starting Salary Expected	-.32
1	Number of Interviewer Contacts Required	-.32

This factor of Realistic Aspirations is defined by the high positive loadings on feelings of ability to do a job sought and the possession of knowledge of what it takes to accomplish that job. The "reality" of the aspirations, for a group that has never held employment, is inferred from the accompanying lower expectations for starting salary on a first job and for highest salary likely to be achieved. Some aspects of adjustment are also present in the form of willingness to contribute to family income, getting along with the family and the ability to obtain credit. Present in the pattern is an indication that the enrollee has been more mobile since leaving NYC (lived in more places) but, somewhat unexplainably, tended to be contacted more readily for the interview.

The last factor, Job Motivation and Planning (Factor IV), is the least dominant but most readily interpretable of the four, with positive loadings on concern for job characteristics, the level of short term vocational plans, the level of the enrollee's current activity and the quality level of the job that he seeks. The coherence of this factor, despite the relatively few variables that enter into its definition, mark it as a candidate for further expansion, by attempts to find other positively associated variables of similar content.

Factor IV

Job Motivation and Planning

Variable		Loading
15	Concern for Job Characteristics	.76
4	Level of Short-Term Plans	.67
3	Level of Current Activity	.65
6	Job Quality Level Sought	.53
10	Reason for Ability (Irrelevant/Relevant)	.48
18	Get Along with Family	.31

Recommended outcome variables for use with this sample, which are fairly self-evident from the factors described, would consist of:

1. Objective-External Data (source other than enrollee self-report)
   - Difficulties experienced with law enforcement agencies
2. Enrollee Provided Data (objectively verifiable)
   - Assessment of problems with law enforcement agencies
   - Part-time work experience
   - Current activities (training and job hunting)
   - Ability to obtain credit

3. Enrollee Provided Data (Attitudinal: not objectively verifiable)

   . Level of job and salary expectations

   . Perceptions of job performance capabilities

   . Family adjustment

In general, the factors described for this group are sufficiently weak and unclear to leave open the question of whether there is an adequate range of variables that can serve as acceptable outcome measures for those who had participated in a youth work training program but were subsequently unable to obtain employment. Some extension of the factors and the variables identified above may improve the precision of the measures and the coherence of the dimensions (e.g., use of more extensive scales and of other external evaluations such as ratings by peers or family). Nevertheless, on the basis of the present evidence, existing criteria would have to be shown to possess reasonable equivalence over time (longitudinally), with a larger sample than was utilized here, before it can be concluded that there are multiple criteria justifiably applicable to this particular subgroup of former enrollees.

Of necessity, all of the recommended sets of outcome variables presented above, for the three enrollee and former enrollee subgroups, are limited by the range of variables that entered into the analyses. Other specific forms of outcome measures, if obtainable and incorporated, might have resulted in modifications to the dimensions identified--though hopefully leaving much of their basic meaning and interpretation intact. (New dimensions would, of course, be expected to emerge had specific intellectual or remedial skills measures been considered appropriate or practical for inclusion as criteria at this stage of development.) However, given the relatively wide range of

behavioral outcomes utilized, the factors should be seen as no more than coherent groupings of broad objectives, within which certain classes of variables can be specified for youth-work training program evaluative needs.

D. "The" Employment Criterion. Because of having dealt with the two former enrollee groups separately in the above analysis, there has not been an opportunity to consider Employment Status per se (i.e., No Employment Experience vs. Employment Experience) as a separate variable, in terms of its relation to other outcome measures. Although not basic to the criterion development purposes of the present study, it is of value to ask what relationships this "highest priority" variable might have with those concurrent outcome measures logically common to a full-time employment experience group and a non-work experience group.*

Fourteen such comparable variables are available from the post-program questionnaire items used in the present study and are, of course, limited to variables derived from adjustment and motivation-planning categories. The partial correlations between Employment Status and the scores on each of the 14 variables, with "Length of Time Out of NYC " partialled out (i.e., held constant, statistically), are shown in Table V.

The only significant correlations with Employment Status occur for "Quality of Job Sought" (r = .40), indicating that those with employment experience tend to seek a higher level job than those who have never been

---

*This should be seen as differing in intent from the more conventional research use of the employment status variable, which is to accept it, rationally, as the "best" outcome and then to search for enrollee personal background characteristics or training program characteristics that differentiate significantly between groups who have and have not held employment (i.e., the variables most predictive of the employment outcome).

Table V

Partial Correlations[1] of Post-Program Employment Experiences (No/Yes)

with 14 Criterion Variables for Post-Program

Employment Experience Group

(Former Enrollee Sample; N ≅ 242)

	Criterion Variable	Partial r
1	Number of Interviewer Contacts Required	-.01
2	Number of Places Lived Since NYC	-.06**
3	Quality of Job Sought	.40
4	Long Range Plans	.04
5	Getting Along with Family	-.07*
6	Amount of Financial Help to Family	.15
7	Number of People Giving You a Hard Time	.04
8	Health Status	.03
9	Number of Times Seen Physician	.01
10	Trouble with Police	-.06
11	Use of Credit	.04
12	Trouble Obtaining Credit	-.10
13	Visits to State Employment	-.06
14	Police Contacts	-.05

[1] "Length of time out of NYC program" held constant (i.e., partialled out)

*r significant at .05 confidence level

**r significant at .01 confidence level

employed full time and "Amount of Financial Assistance to Family" (r = .15) which constitutes a very slight tendency for those with work experience to be willing to contribute more money for family use than those who have never worked would be willing to contribute (if they were to obtain employment).

Based on the relatively limited number and scope of outcome variables analyzed here (that are common to former enrollees with and without employment experience), there is no strong evidence of a meaningful pattern of concurrent relevance for the Employment Status criterion measure. It should be clear that a considerable loss of information would be incurred regarding what has happened to former enrollees and, more important, how and why it may have happened if there were total dependence on this relatively limited, dichotomous, criterion in attempting to understand performance outcomes.

E. Some Descriptive Highlights of the Post-Program Samples

Although the main concern of this study is one of defining important criterion dimensions that stem from relationships between outcome variables, examination of the distributions for these variables leads to a number of "survey," or descriptive, results that seem worth highlighting. These descriptions are summarized very briefly and only as suggestive of research hypotheses, or further study needs, regarding post-program enrollee behaviors that might have been influenced by program operations.

(1) Of the sample of 242 former NYC enrollees (selected only on the basis of whether they were out of the program for approximately 6 to 18 months), 88 enrollees or 36% were found never to have held full-time employment. Add to this the finding that, of the 154 who held full-time employment in at least one job, 45% were unemployed on the day of the interview and it

becomes apparent that these school dropouts did not fare particularly well in achieving steady employment during mid-1970.*

(2) Of the 154 enrollees who eventually found full-time employment 37% reported doing so within 30 days after leaving NYC.

(3) NYC served as the primary source through which these 154 obtained their first full-time job (27%), with "friends" reported as the next most frequent source (16%).

(4) Between the time they left NYC and the time of the questionnaire interview, two-thirds of the sample of 154 with full-time employment experience had held only one job, with a mean time on the job of approximately 5 months. In effect, they could not as a group be classified as "job hoppers"--although it is equally likely that they have lesser opportunity than other workers to move from job to job.

(5) For the 154 enrollees with full-time employment experience, 50% claimed never to have utilized the State Employment Service; whereas, among the 88 without full-time employment experience, 61% indicate never having visited SES. The State Employment Service appears to be avoided as a resource by a majority of former enrollees. Along with this, it should be noted that only 11% of the sample attributed the obtaining of their first job to the efforts of SES.

(6) Over half of the sample of 88 enrollees, who had no post-program employment experience, still evidenced some vocational "motivation" either

---

*Unemployment levels reported for the black teenage population, at about that same time, ranged as high as 34% (Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, 1970).

in the form of active job seeking (37%), or by enrollment in another youth-working training program or in a school (23%). There were, however, 25% of the sample (22 enrollees) found to be "not working--not looking," with 10 of those 22 classified as "housewives."

In conjunction with the above descriptive characteristics for single criterion variables, it is appropriate to point out, briefly, the possible biases that may have operated for several of the criterion measures with regard to sex. These samples, if divided by sex, were far too inadequate in size to allow separate correlational and factorial analyses. However, sample sizes in two of the three samples (Program Completion and Post-Program: Employment Experience Groups) were adequate enough to permit gross comparisons of the distributions of scores for males and females on most variables.

With only a few exceptions, the male and female subgroups were found sufficiently comparable on the distributions of scores selected for analyses to warrant their combined use. Those criteria retained for use because of their high level of logical priority as outcomes, but for which biasing effects for sex can be suspected, were: (1) The variables of "police contacts" and "trouble with police" (i.e., claimed and actual) in all three samples--with females having significantly fewer police contacts, by far, than males and consequently a much more highly skewed distribution. The extreme skewness found led to dichotomization of the variable for analytical purposes (i.e., No Police Contacts vs. Police Contacts); (2) "Starting Salary" for first job obtained (Post-Program:Employment Experience Sample) showed a significantly higher mean for males with greater positive skewness of the distribution for females; (3) Salary expectation scores ("Starting Salary" and "Highest Salary Expected") in the Program-Completion Sample also resulted in the female sample having

distributions of greater positive skewness and significantly lower mean values; (4) "Number of Jobs Chosen for Training," in the Program Completion group showed a more negatively skewed distribution and higher mean value for the female sample.

A look at any additional suspected biasing sources, expressed as subgroup difference in distributions or other characteristics of the variables (e.g., regression slopes), and the detailed analyses required to confirm those biases, would require more extensive research effort than was practical within the scope, intent and available data of the present study.*

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

This criterion study phase has represented an initial attempt to provide information that would aid in the selection of objectives potentially applicable to a youth-work training program. At the same time, it was intended that the study illustrate an analytical approach to criterion development based on the use of multiple criterion measures. By utilizing samples of adolescent school dropouts, some of whom were enrolled in a youth-work training program and others who were former enrollees, it has been possible to identify an assortment of empirically defensible and coherent factors, or categories of objectives, from which measures best applicable for research and evaluation purposes can be identified. In essence, the factors have provided an overview

---

*Determination of bias or "unfairness" for any behavioral measures has taken on much more complex meaning than implied here (Cleary, 1968; Rock, 1970). Such efforts entail detailed regression analyses in a predictive framework to demonstrate more specific operation of subgroup criterion biases.

of structural features for a broadly-based set of "core" criterion measures. They therefore serve as a framework for assessing the value of the particular measures applied, as well as being suggestive of scales into which new criteria can be incorporated. At the same time, the factor designations and interpretations have been unavoidably descriptive of important patterns of behavioral outcomes that characterize what has, in fact, happened to samples of enrollees who are (or were) enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps work-training program.

Certain assumptions, which were advanced for undertaking the development of program criteria, have been viewed as integral to the design and method of the study and to the utility of the results. These can be summarized as:

(1) The inherent advantages of <u>empirical evidence</u> to identify and justify program objectives as opposed to primary dependence on rationally, or logically, derived lists of goal statements. The latter can represent no more than a first step in identifying a domain of possible outcome variables to be assessed quantitatively and not the end-product (i.e., perennial conclusions of investigatory efforts citing "the pressing need for clear definition of objectives" represent no more than "motherhood" statements where they lack understanding of, and reference to, measurement processes required to construct a viable system of goals).

(2) The need for reasonable <u>uniformity of measured objectives</u> as essential to the interpretation and understanding of research and evaluative conclusions. Selection of objectives or dependent study variables predominantly on an "ad lib" basis, following from an investigator's hunches, or the ready availability of information, can only obscure comparability of findings between studies and between similar youth-work training programs.

Even where practical demands force limitations in the choice of measured objectives, or new measures are sought, better estimates can be made of the value of any variables chosen if these stem from some knowledge of the goal dimensions into which outcome variables are expected to fit.

(3) The advantage of continuity in monitoring program objectives and feeding back information. Standards are not immutable! Measured objectives are known to possess dynamic qualities which result in differences in their applicability, or meaning, at different points in time (i.e., as immediate, intermediate and long-term objectives) and as a result of modifications in program goals that follow from the feedback of evaluative results.

(4) The advantages of using multiple variables to encompass goal dimensions that define complex behavioral outcomes. Patterns of interrelationships among criterion variables can be used to define a common core of meaningful groupings from which composite criteria can be constructed for objectifying a variety of desired goal statements.

The findings of the present study, based on cross-sectionally obtained data, have indicated that goal dimensions differ in their coherence and value as a function of the type of criterion group under study and the variables applicable to that group. Thus, a sample of former youth-work training program enrollees, who have had employment experience, yield the most readily interpretable clusters of outcome variables. The distal or intermediate criteria obtainable from such a group clustered on six, rather clearly identifiable, factors. Dominant among these--and potentially the best composite criterion scale--was a "Job Success and Adjustment" factor. This was defined primarily by the presence of various job performance criteria, along with

several adjustment measures; all of which characterized the enrollee who was more likely to enter a white-collar organization after leaving the training program. A more specific criterion factor was found to describe a "Job Stability-Mobility" cluster, with the interpretation indicating that the more mobile in jobs and residence, the less job-proficient the former enrollee tended to be. "Striving for Vocational Success" is another job-oriented dimension for which the variables describe performance outcomes for an ex-enrollee employed in a better quality job, who has performed well and desires to be upwardly mobile; with the last of these relatively independent vocational-performance clusters found to define degree of job success for the former enrollee who tended to be employed in a blue-collar industrial setting and who had a higher quality job as well as having obtained more raises. More distinctly adjustment-oriented factors were also uncovered. One dealt with aspects of "Community-Family Adjustment" and was descriptive of an ex-enrollee who has fewer problems with police, family and other community members. The other was definable as a "Vocational Adjustment" pattern for enrollees who had changed jobs. The factor coupled job proficiency and job capability with feelings of vocational dissatisfaction.

In contrast to the factors found for the former enrollee group, with full-time job experience, the least interpretable and weakest set of usable goal dimensions were found for those enrollees who were never employed full time after leaving the training program. The four dimensions identified as potentially applicable were "Community Adjustment," "Realistic Aspiration (Confidence)," "Striving for Personal Improvement" and "Job Motivation-Planning." It was pointed out that criteria usable for evaluating success

in this group would, logically, be more limited in scope, since a group that has never been employed is not readily measureable on as broad a range of performance criteria as those who have held employment, nor on measures that are as "objective" and verifiable. Without development of a wider assortment of outcome measures (e.g., evaluations by family, peers, or other community members), doubts have been raised about the applicability of meaningful standards of "success" for a group that has failed to obtain employment over a period of months, or years, after leaving the youth-work training program.

The shorter-term or immediate outcome measures available after the enrollee has been in the program for some months (i.e., "completed" the program), were found to be adequate for further developmental application under five reasonably coherent dimensions. These were defined as "Training Program Adjustment" (representing the dominant one, and best potential composite scale), "Social Adjustment," "Job Aspiration Level," "Planning Competency" and "Personal Image." Here again, however, there are logical constraints found in the range of variables applicable to a definition of enrollee "success" at the completion of a youth-work training program. The majority of the outcome variables were confined to subjective, attitudinal measures dependent upon responses provided by the enrollee. Nevertheless, some reasonable set of "externally" derived outcomes were also shown to be of value, in the form of evaluations by program professionals (counselors), work supervisory personnel and peers (fellow enrollees); in addition to information from program administrative records (work site absences) and law enforcement agencies (police contacts). (Certainly, where a given program

includes specific skill components, dealing with remedial skills for example, it is assumed that available, formal, verbal and arithmetic tests would be incorporated in any mix of short-term criteria.)

Recommendations for future research efforts are concerned with three forms of additional analysis considered essential to more complete development and understanding of the criteria identified. These are:

(a) Explicit determination of the equivalence of the shorter-term criteria, on the basis of their correlations with the longer-term outcome measures. This important form of analysis requires the more time consuming longitudinal study design, with follow-up of the same enrollees over some acceptable time period beyond program "completion." The step is critical, since the extent to which the more quickly and readily obtainable end-of-program criteria are of value, in an evaluative system, is wholly a function of their relationship to longer-term (higher priority) objectives.

(b) Evaluation of the role of the criterion measures (or their dimensions) in a predictor-criterion system as a means of enhancing the understanding of criterion value and meaning. It is currently expected that this would be accomplished by utilizing a battery of guidance tests under development for disadvantaged adolescents (Freeberg, 1970) which, along with other measures, would constitute the predictors for such a system. In effect this not only provides an opportunity to validate the measures of a newly developed test battery but at the same time aids in clearer definition of the most effective (i.e., predictable) program outcomes.

(c) A continuing search for criterion biases, as a consequence of subgroup differences, that might affect the "true" criterion scores achieved. Analyses to determine various forms of "psychometric bias" (Rock, 1970)

would require adequate sample size in order to demonstrate the possible systematic biasing of score distributions, over a variety of subgroups of interest, beyond the limited male-female comparisons briefly pointed out in the present study.

On the basis of experiences in data collection for the present study, an additional class of recommendations, bearing on administrative concerns seem pertinent. These touch on one of the most crucial problem areas in the application of objectives for youth-work training program research and evaluation--i.e., the availability of outcome information. As indicated previously in this paper, data gathering problems can be unusually difficult to overcome when the samples are composed of poverty-level adolescents, many of whom are likely to be minority group members living in urban ghetto areas. There are also ethical considerations that have been discussed which can further limit data availability and add to sample biases, or nonrepresentativeness.

It is worth stressing again that no research or evaluation effort can be any better than the quality of the criterion data available-- and furthermore that the quality of those data can be compromised seriously when there are severe limitations in the ability to obtain needed follow-up information. Data availability for former enrollee populations of youth-work training programs is seen as a problem to be ameliorated largely by administrative-programmatic means, rather than passively accepted, or compensated for, solely by research design and statistical method. In this regard, the following general suggestions are made in order to enhance data gathering for a system of outcome measures. (Where feasible, there may be an opportunity to

implement several of these recommendations in a presently anticipated longitudinal, follow-up study effort dealing with test validation and further criterion development.)

The major need is for the establishment of a national staff of professionally trained interviewers (i.e., data gathering "specialists"), located in the specific geographic areas where data pertinent to youth-work training programs are most likely to be collected. These individuals should be responsible for ongoing, periodic data gathering from present and former training program enrollees. The nature of the data required for a criterion system, the sampling procedures and the points in time when the data are to be obtained should be specified with reasonable uniformity.

A second suggested requirement, essential to the implementation of the first, is dependent upon the ability of data gathering personnel to maintain periodic contact with former enrollees. Attempts to maintain contact, although difficult to implement and not a complete solution to sampling problems can, in the long run, be far less costly and more beneficial to program needs than the conventional (often nonsystematic) means required to locate samples of former enrollees for each new research and evaluation purpose. Among the recommended techniques that might be attempted are: First, an explicit expression of intent, communicated to each enrollee by work training program personnel, that efforts will be made to maintain contact with him in order to find out how he is "getting along" vocationally and to solicit his opinions about the value of the program. He could, for example, be apprised of the possibility of his being contacted (e.g., six months or one year) after he leaves the program in order to obtain such information and for which he would be paid if he chose to participate. Second, and in close

conjunction with this intent would be the necessity to offer a reason for maintaining such contact; with some defined "pay off" for the enrollee, other than financial payments alone. Possible ways of accomplishing this might be by providing forms of desirable post-program services. These could, for example, range from a brief newsletter (containing vocationally useful information and accompanied by a return postcard on which categories of other desired information can be checked), to notification of in-person vocational guidance or job placement services that are readily available to the former enrollee through the youth-work training program or the State Employment Service. The success of any such attempts to maintain contact over some reasonable post-program period is contingent largely on the regularity and quality of the services that can be instituted.

Ultimately, the ability to select objectives, tailor them to changing program goals and apply them meaningfully for evaluative purposes, must arise from reasonable access to forms of information essential to the measurement of those objectives. Planned data collection procedures, that provide continuity in the flow of quantitative information, serve as the cornerstone for establishing and conducting defensible youth-work training programs.

References

Bass, B. M. Further evidence on the dynamic character of criteria. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 93-97.

Borow, H. Man in a World at Work. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

Borus, M. E., & Tash, W. R. Measuring the impact of manpower programs: a primer. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1970.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.

Brogden, H. E., & Taylor, E. K. The theory and classification of criteria bias. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1950, 10, 159-186.

Burtt, H. E. Principles of Employment Psychology. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

Cleary, A. Test bias: Prediction of grades of Negro and White students in integrated colleges. Journal of Educational Measurement, 1968, 115-124.

Duncan, O., Hatt, P., & North, C. Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Dunnette, M. D. A note on the criterion. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 251-253.

Dunnette, M. D., Campbell, J. P., & Hakel, M. D. Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1967, 2, 143-174.

Federal Register. Title 29 - Labor. Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects. Vol. 34, No. 230, December, 1969, 19074-19075. U. S. Government Printing Office.

Freeberg, N. E. Development of evaluation measures for use with neighborhood youth corps enrollees. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service. Project Report 68-5, December 1968.

Freeberg, N. E. Assessment of disadvantaged adolescents: A different approach to research and evaluation measures. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 229-240.

Ghiselli, E. E. The prediction of predictability. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 3-8.

Ghiselli, E. E., & Brown, C. W. Personnel and Industrial Psychology (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1955.

Ghiselli, E. E., & Haire, M. The validation of selection tests in the light of the dynamic nature of criteria. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 225-231.

Gordon, E. W. Characteristics of socially disadvantaged children. Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35, 377-388.

Greenwood, E. Experimental sociology: A study in method. New York: King's Crown Press, 1945.

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954.

Herman, M., & Sadofsky, S. Youth-work programs. New York: Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, 1966.

Heron, A. Satisfaction and satisfactoriness: Complementary aspects of occupational adjustment. Occupational Psychology, 1954, 28, 140-153.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Hinrichs, J. R. A replicated study of job satisfaction dimensions. Personnel Psychology, 1968, 21, 479-503.

Holland, J. L. Major programs of research on vocational behavior. In Henry Borow (Ed.), Man in a world at work. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

Hoppock, R. Job satisfaction. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1935.

Hunt, D. E., & Hardt, R. H. Characterization of summer Upward Bound programs. Summary Report. Syracuse: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, 1966.

Kaiser, H. F. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.

Kendall, L. M., Smith, P. C., Hulin, C. I., & Locke, E. A. Cornell Study of Job Satisfaction: IV. The Relative Validity of the Job Descriptive Index and Other Methods of Measurement of Job Satisfaction. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1963.

Krug, R. E. Personnel selection. In B. Von H. Gilmer (Ed.), Industrial Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Levitan, S. A., & Mangum, G. L. Federal training and work programs in the sixties. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1969.

Mangum, G. L. The emergence of manpower policy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Manpower Vocational Education Weekly, 1970, 1, No. 6. Washington, D. C.: Capitol Publications, Inc.

Nagle, B. F. Criterion development. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 271-288.

Owens, W. A., & Jewell, D. O. Personnel selection. Annual Review of Psychology, 1969, 20, 419-446.

Parnes, H.S., Miljus, R., & Spitz, R. Career threshold: A longitudinal study of the educational and labor market experience of male youth 14-24 years of age. Vol. I. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University, Feb. 1969.

Polermo, J. M. Test validation--A new must. Personnel Administrator, 1969, 5-12.

Rock, D. A. Motivation, moderators, and test bias. The University of Toledo Law Review, Numbers 2 & 3, Spring-Summer, 1970.

Sedlacek, W. E. An empirical description of available theory and research on job satisfaction. Midwestern Psychology Association, Chicago, May, 1966.

Stephenson, R. Occupational aspirations and plans of 443 ninth graders. Journal of Educational Research, 1955, 49, 27-35.

Super, D. E. The psychology of careers. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Thorndike, R. L. Personnel selection. New York: John Wiley, 1949.

Tiffin, J., & McCormick, E. J. Industrial Psychology (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

United States Department of Labor. A compilation of papers on data gathering in manpower research, Office of Manpower Research, Washington, D.C., September, 1969. (Unpublished manuscript)

United States Department of Labor. Occupational Outlook Handbook. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

U. S. Employment Service. Dictionary of occupational titles. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

U. S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Profile of Youth, 1963. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Walther, R., & Magnusson, M. L. A retrospective study of the effectiveness of out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in four urban sites. Washington, D. C.: Social Research Group, George Washington University, 1967.

Wherry, R. J. The past and future of criterion evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 1-5.

Wherry, R. J. Factor analysis of morale data: Reliability and validity. Personnel Psychology, 1958, 11, 78-80.

Wherry, R. J., & Fryer, D. F. Buddy ratings: Popularity contest or leadership criteria? Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 147-159.

Wylie, R. The self-concept: A critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Appendix A

Criterion Variables and Corresponding Questionnaire Item Numbers or Information Source

Criterion Variables

(Program Completion)

Variable	Questionnaire Item No.
1. Vocational Adequacy: Total Scale	10 through 16
2. Quality of First Job Desired	17
3. Reason for Selecting Job (Irrelevant/Relevant)	18
4. Awareness of Job Characteristics Scale (Total Score)	18(a) through 18(g)
5. Knowledge of Job Selected	19
6. Ability to Do Job	20
7. Starting Salary Expected	21
8. Highest Salary Expected	21(a)
9. Ways to Look for Job (No. of Relevant Responses)	22
10. Important Things to Ask Job Interviewer (Response Adequacy)	23
11. Job Search Plans (Suitability)	24
12. Long Range Plans (Job Quality)	25
13. Ability to Accomplish Plans (Relevance of Response)	26
14. Get Along with Family	32
15. Family Feelings about Enrollee	33
16. Financial Assistance to Family	34
17. Save Money	35
18. Number of People Giving Enrollee a Hard Time	36
19. Health Problems (No/Yes)	37
20. Amount of Trouble with the Police	38
21. Importance of Keeping Out of Trouble	41
22. Number of Jobs Chosen for Training	Job Lists (Page 10)
23. Willingness to Take Training Full Time	44
24. Willingness to Train Part Time	45
25. Job Motivation Scale (Total Score)	46(a) through 46(g)

External Information	Data Source
26. Counselor Rating Scale	11 item scale:Appendix E
27. Work Supervisor Scale	10 item scale:Appendix E
28. Actual Police Contacts	Local agency
29. Number Work Site Assignments	NYC Project
30. Number Work Site Absences	NYC Project
31. Peer Rating Score	Peer Rating Scales:Appendix B
32. Number of Times Chosen for Peer Rating	

Criterion Variables

(Post-Program: No Employment Experience)

	Variable	Questionnaire Item No.
1.	Number of Interviewer Contacts Required	No Item #:Upper right on quest. cover page
2.	Number of Places Lived Since Left NYC	10
3.	Level of Current Activity	11 (Page 9)
4.	Level of Short-Term Plans	15
5.	Part Time Work (No/Yes)	16
6.	Job Quality Level Sought	17
7.	Reason Picked Job Sought (Irrelevant/Relevant)	18
8.	Knowledge of Job Sought	19
9.	Ability to Reform Job Sought	20
10.	Reason for Ability (Irrelevant/Relevant)	20(a)
11.	Starting Salary Expected	21
12.	Highest Salary Expected	22
13.	Ways to Look for Job (Degree of Relevance)	23
14.	Things to Ask About Job	24
15.	Concern for Job Characteristics (Total Scale Score)	25(a) through 25(g)
16.	Long Range Work Plans (Quality)	26
17.	Means to Achieve Plans	27
18.	Get Along with Family	28
19.	Future Financial Contribution to Family	29
20.	Number of People Giving Hard Time	30
21.	Health Problems (No/Yes)	31
22.	Number of Times Visited a Doctor	32
23.	Amount of Trouble with Police	33
24.	Credit Buying (No/Yes)	37
25.	Ease of Obtaining Credit	38
26.	Visits to State Employment Service	39

	External Information	Data Source
27.	Actual Police Contacts	Local agency

Criterion Variables

(Post-Program: Employment Experience)

	Variable	Questionnaire Item No.
1.	Number of Interviewer Contacts Required	No Item #:Upper right on quest. cover page
2.	Number of Places Lived Since Left NYC	10
3.	Employed Now (No/Yes)	11
4.	Industrial Category (White Collar/Blue Collar)	13
5.	Job Quality (Present or Last Job)	14
6.	Hours Worked/Week	15
7.	Length on Present (or last) Job	16
8.	Number of Jobs Held Since NYC	17(a)
9.	Reason Left Job (Poor/Good)	17(d)
10.	Time to Find First Job	18
11.	Number of Sources Used for First Job	19
12.	Number of Places Interviewed	20
13.	Number of Applications Filed	21
14.	Met Job Expectations	22
15.	Starting Salary	23
16.	Number of Salary Raises	24
17.	Amount of First Raise	24
18.	Promotion (No/Yes)	25
19.	Job Satisfaction Scale (Total Score)	26 through 34
20.	Level of Short Term Plans	36 [36(a)]
21.	Job Level Sought (Short Term)	37 [37(a)]
22.	Level of Long-Term Plans	41
23.	Getting Along with Family	43
24.	Family Feelings about Enrollee	44
25.	Financial Assistance to Family	45
26.	Number of People Giving Hard Time	46
27.	Health Problems (No/Yes)	47
28.	Number Times Visited Doctor	48
29.	Save Money	49
30.	Amount of Trouble with Police	50
31.	Credit Buying (No/Yes)	54
32.	Ease of Obtaining Credit	55
33.	Number of Visits to USES	56
34.	Permission for Employer Rating (No/Yes)	58

	External Information	Data Source
35.	Employer Rating	Employer (present or last job)
36.	Police Contacts (No/Yes)	Local agency

Appendix B

Program Completion Questionnaire

NYC Enrollee Questionnaire
(Program Completion Group)

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J.

Instructions

I'm helping the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey do a survey of Neighborhood Youth Corps. We would like to find out how people who have been in NYC for a while have been getting by since they came into the program. Like--how things have been working out for you in general; what you think you've gotten out of being in NYC; how you feel about jobs; and what kind of things you would like to do from now on. We plan to use what we find out to make training programs like NYC better for enrollees.

The answers you give to any questions are all <u>confidential</u> and <u>secret</u> and we would never give out any information about anyone's answers. So there is no way it would be used to affect you personally. Anything we find out from these interviews would only be reported for a whole group of people at a time (like a few hundred) and we would <u>never</u> use anybody's name.

This should take only a little over a half hour and I'll pay you $3.00 for your time.

ED 056 068

NYC ENROLLEE QUESTIONNAIRE
(Program Completion Group)

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J.

(1) Name _____ ☐ M ☐ F
(Last) (First) (Middle)

(2) NYC project _____ ☐ W ☐ Sp.

(3) How long have you been in NYC _____ (months)

(4) Date of birth _____

(5) Place of birth _____
(City) (State)

(6) Highest school grade completed (when entered NYC) _____

(7) Marital status ☐ Single ☐ Married

☐ Divorced or separated ☐ Widowed

(8) Living with: /single response or appropriate combination/

☐ Mother ☐ Wife or Husband ☐ Stepmother

☐ Father ☐ Brother(s) or Sister(s) ☐ Stepfather

☐ Guardian ☐ Relatives and/or Friends

☐ Children ☐ Live alone

(9) Address /where presently living/

_____
Street City State

==========

I would like to know how you feel about being able to make it--as far as jobs go--after you leave NYC. Like--

--do you think

(10) You're going to be able to get the kind of job you want when you leave NYC

☐ For sure. No problem ☐ Might have some chance ☐ Not much chance

TM 000 866

1112

--do you think

(11) If you get a decent job you'll be able to do the work well enough to satisfy any boss

☐ Not much chance on most jobs ☐ Maybe on most jobs ☐ Yes! On any good job you get

--do you think

(12) You'll be able to get by on a job without a lot of help from the boss or the people you work with

☐ Sure to get by on your own without help ☐ You may need a little help sometimes ☐ You're going to need a lot of help from other people

--do you think

(13) If you get a job where you have to learn something new, you could learn enough to do the job right

☐ Anytime; for any job ☐ Maybe: could learn for some jobs ☐ You would have a tough time if you have to learn something new

--do you think

(14) Once you get a job, you've got what it takes to get promoted and move up to better jobs

☐ Would be rough for you to get promotions ☐ Maybe on some jobs ☐ You could get promoted for sure on any job

--do you think

(15) You know enough about how to look for jobs to be able to get one after NYC

☐ No problem. You know all the important ways to look for a job ☐ You know something about looking but would need some help ☐ Not too much. You need to know a lot more about how to look for a job

--do you think

(16) Being in NYC has made you feel more like you're going to be able to make it in a job later on

☐ It was no help at all ☐ It was some help ☐ Yes. It's helped a lot

(17) After you leave NYC what's your first move as far as a job goes--What kind of job would you look for /If going into military--"What possible job after military?"/

☐ Don't know

_____
/Obtain job choice, if possible/

(18) What's the most important reason that you picked that job

_____
/Reason/

==========

As far as any job goes how about things like:

(18a) You get a chance to do interesting work

☐ That's real important ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ Don't really care about that

(18b) You can get paid what you're worth on that kind of job

☐ Don't really care about that ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ That's real important

(18c) You wouldn't have to worry about being fired

☐ Don't really care about that ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ That's real important

(18d) You feel like you're doing work that's worth doing

☐ That's real important ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ Don't really care about that

(18e) You can get raises and make more money fast in that job

☐ That's real important ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ Don't really care about that

(18f) You have a chance for steady work in that kind of job

☐ Don't really care about that ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ That's real important

(18g) You have the feeling that you're not pushed for more work than you can do

☐ That's real important ☐ May be important: not too sure ☐ Don't really care about that

(19) How much do you know about what it takes to do the job of a _____
/as given in item #17/

☐ Know a lot about that kind of job

☐ Know a few things about what the job takes

☐ Don't really know much about it

(20) Do you think you would be able to do that work right now

☐ Yes ☐ Not sure ☐ No

/If yes/

(20a) Why do you think you could do that (What reasons?)
/List reasons/

_____ _____

_____ _____

(21) What salary do you think you would make when you start the job of a _____
/as given in item #17/

_____/hr.

(21a) How high do you think you could go in pay on that job _____/hr.

(22) What are the ways you would look for that job (What would you check out?)
/List as many items as given/

_____ _____

_____ _____

(23) When you go to apply for the job of _____ what would
/as given in item #17/
be the most important thing you would ask the interviewer about the job /No prompts/

☐ Don't know

_____
Most important

_____
Next most important

(24) If the first job you get doesn't work out and you decide to drop it what would you do

☐ Just don't know

/Try for at least one response/

_____ _____

/If "look for another job," or "go for schooling" of any sort/

(24a) What job (what course in school) _____

(25) What kind of work do you plan to be doing over a longer time--say 5 to 10 years from now

☐ Don't know -- (don't plan that far ahead)

/Try for choice of work/

_____

(26) How will you get to do that /No prompts: List responses as given/

☐ Don't know _____ _____

_____ _____

==========

Take a look at this list of other guys (girls) enrolled here in NYC with you. Which one of them do you know best (even if don't know any too well).

_____
(Name of Enrollee)

I want to ask you some questions about him (her). Please remember any answers you give are strictly private. Nobody in NYC would ever see these answers.

(27) How well do you know him (her)

☐ Real well ☐ Pretty good ☐ Not too well

(28) How long do you know him (her) _____
(weeks or months)

(29) In what way are you friendly with him (her)

☐ On the job at NYC only ☐ Outside of the NYC job only ☐ Both on the job and outside of NYC

/If known "outside of NYC Job Only," go to item #(31a)/

==========

From what you know of this guy (girl) would you say he (she)

(30a) Can get a job done when the supervisor gives him (her) something to do.

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30b) Gets along with other people on the job

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30c) Looks for ways to get out of doing work

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30d) Stays out of trouble on the job

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30e) Gets along with the work supervisor

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30f) The kind of guy (girl) who could make good on almost any sort of job

☐ Yes, for sure ☐ Maybe ☐ Probably not

/Know "outside of NYC job only"/

(31a) Gets along with people pretty well

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31b) Wants to get somewhere and make good

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31c) Keeps out of trouble

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31d) Should make out pretty well on his (her) own after leaving NYC

☐ Yes, for sure ☐ Maybe ☐ Probably not

Now look at this list of NYC enrollees again and pick out the person you know NEXT BEST.

_____
(Name of Enrollee)

I want to ask you some questions about him (her). Please remember any answers you give are strictly private. Nobody in NYC would ever see these answers.

(27a) How well do you know him (her)

☐ Real well ☐ Pretty good ☐ Not too well

(28a) How long do you know him (her)_____
(weeks or mos.)

(29a) In what way are you friendly with him (her)

☐ On the job at NYC only ☐ Outside of the NYC job only ☐ Both on the job and outside of NYC

[If known "outside of NYC Job Only," go to item #(31e)]

From what you know of this guy (girl) would you say he (she)

(30g) Can get a job done when the supervisor gives him (her) something to do

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30h) Gets along with other people on the job

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30i) Looks for ways to get out of doing work

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30j) Stays out of trouble on the job

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(30k) Gets along with the work supervisor

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(301) The kind of guy (girl) who could make good on almost any sort of job

☐ Yes, for sure ☐ Maybe ☐ Probably not

/Know "outside of NYC job only"/

(31e) Gets along with people pretty well

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31f) Wants to get somewhere and make good

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31g) Keeps out of trouble

☐ That's just the way he (she) is ☐ Sometimes like that ☐ That's not the way he (she) is

(31h) Should make out pretty well on his (her) own after leaving NYC

☐ Yes, for sure ☐ Maybe ☐ Probably not

(32) How have you been getting along with your family since being in NYC (parents, guardian(s), spouse)

☐ No Family /Go to item #35/

☐ Bad-just don't get along with your family at all ☐ Fair- you get by with them ☐ Get along great with your family - no problems

(33) How does your family feel about what you're doing now (in NYC)

☐ They think you're doing great ☐ They think you're getting by okay ☐ They don't think you're doing anything worth much

(34) About how much of what you make at NYC do you give to your family _____/wk.

(35) Do you save any money from your NYC pay

☐ All the time (out of just about every week's pay) ☐ A little--off and on ☐ Don't save any of it

(36) On this list that I show you let me know which of these people or places have been giving you a hard time lately

____ Supervisor at work
____ People you work with
____ Social worker (Welfare)
____ State employment
____ NYC counselor
____ The police or the courts
____ Neighbors, people you know on your block
____ Lawyers
____ Credit collection outfits
____ Storekeepers
____ Sombody in your family
____ A hospital, or people that work in a hospital clinic (like the doctors; the clerks)

Any others? _____

(37) Do you have any ills or problems with your health that bother you

☐ No ☐ Yes

(38) Have you gotten in any trouble with the police since you've been in NYC (arrested and charged, or booked)

☐ No ☐ Just once ☐ A couple of times ☐ More than a couple of times

[Go to Item #41]

(39) An convictions

☐ None ☐ One conviction ☐ A couple of convictions ☐ More than a couple

(40) Have you been put on probation since you enrolled in NYC

☐ No ☐ Yes

(41) How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the cops and the law

☐ Real important: you go out of your way to avoid trouble
☐ You usually try to steer clear unless you're pushed real hard
☐ Not too important: if you get in trouble you don't care too much

Here s a list of names of a lot of different jobs people might want to try for after they leave NYC. It also tells a little about what you do on these jobs. Tell me which ones are the kinds of jobs you'd be willing to take training in when you leave NYC. Let me go through the list with you. (Read through job list with respondent. Mark all items chosen.)

Job List

MALES

___ 1. Heavy Appliance Repairman - Fixes things like washing machines, refrigerators and air conditioners.

___ 2. Lathe Operator - Runs a machine that makes metal parts.

___ 3. Store Salesman - Sells things to customers and makes out sales records.

___ 4. Printer - Runs a printing press to turn out books and pamphlets.

___ 5. Construction Carpenter - Builds house frames and puts together other wooden parts of buildings.

___ 6. Arc Welder - Welds metal parts together with electric welding torch.

___ 7. Personnel Interviewer - Asks questions and takes down information from people applying for jobs.

___ 8. Bookkeeper - Keeps records of money and finances for a business.

___ 9. Auto Mechanic - Checks out car troubles and fixes them.

___10. Construction Steel Worker - works on steel frames of new buildings.

___11. Watch Repairman - Fixes watches or clocks.

___12. Draftsman - Makes drawings used as blueprints for buildings.

___13. Tractor Trailer Driver - drives trucks over long distances.

___14. Plumber - Installs pipes and faucets in buildings and fixes them.

___15. Electronic Technician - Helps check out and put together parts of electrical equipment.

FEMALES

___ 1. Bank Clerk - Handles money that people put in and take out of the bank.

___ 2. Laboratory Technician - Takes care of laboratory equipment and does tests on chemical samples.

___ 3. Clothing Store Saleswoman - Sells clothes to customers and makes out sales records.

___ 4. Secretary - Typist - Types letters in an office and keeps things properly filed.

___ 5. Hair Stylist - Cuts and sets women's hair in a beauty parlor.

___ 6. Window Dresser - Sets up merchandise in store windows to attract customers.

___ 7. Personnel Interviewer - Asks questions and takes down information from people applying for jobs.

___ 8. Bookkeeper - Keeps records of money and finances for a busi-ness.

___ 9. Teacher's Aid - Helps teacher teach children in a classroom.

___10. Practical Nurse - Takes care of sick people in their homes.

___11. Dentist's Assistant - Helps dentist take care of patients.

___12. Travel Agent - Helps people make plans for taking vacation trips.

___13. Stock Clerk - Keeps records of stock and supplies for a company.

___14. Telephone Operator - Help people make telephone calls.

___15. Computer Keypunch Operator - Operate machine to put informa-tion on computer cards.

(42) Which one of those that you marked would you like best _____
(name)

(43) Which one on the list wouldn't you like at all _____
(name)

(44) How much would you have to be paid to take training full-time for that job you liked best?

☐ You wouldn't take training full-time for any pay

☐ Take about the same as NYC pay ..... /NYC pay _____/hr./

☐ You would want more than NYC pay..... How much _____/hr.

(45) Suppose while you were here at NYC you had a chance to take special training as a _____. What would you want to take some
(Given in item #42)
training for a couple of hours a night--in your spare time.

☐ You would do it for no extra pay

☐ You wouldn't bother

☐ You would want the same pay per hour as NYC

☐ You would want morethan your NYC pay per hour. How much _____/hr.

(46) If you could get this job you want as _____
(Given in item #42)
when you leave NYC, what's the least pay you would take. _____/hr.

(46a) How much would you want if you had to move out of the city to get that job (away from your family and friends)

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take that job for any money if that is the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay: How much more pay _____/hr.

(46b) How much would you want if the guy you would work for in that job was going to be on your back a lot

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take that job for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

(46c) How much would you want if you had to do some extra work that was dirty as part of that job

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ Wouldn't take that job for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

(46d) How much would you want if you had to go to school at night on your own time for special training in that job

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take it for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

(46e) How much would you want if you didn't like the people you had to work with on that job

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take it for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

(46f) If you would get a fair raise each year but no chance to get promoted for a long time (like 3 years or more)

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take it for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

(46g) If there was always pressure on the job to get a lot of work done

☐ Wouldn't matter; you would still take the same pay

☐ You wouldn't take it for any money if that's the way it was

☐ Take it for more pay. How much more pay _____/hr.

Additional comments

Appendix C

Post-Program Questionnaire
Section I: Former Enrollees with Employment Experience
Section II: Former Enrollees with No Employment Experience

Former NYC Enrollee Questionnaire
(Post-NYC Groups)

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J.

Instructions

I'm helping the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey do a survey of how people who were in Neighborhood Youth Corps have made out since they left the program. Like -- how things have worked out for you in general; how much work you've been able to get; how you feel about jobs and what kinds of things you would like to do from now on. We plan to use what we find out to make training programs like NYC better for the people who have been in them.

The answers you give to any questions are all confidential and secret and we would never give out any information about anyone's answers. So there is no way it would be used to affect you personally. Anything we find out from these interviews would only be reported for a whole group of people at a time (like a few hundred) and we would never use anybody's name.

This should take only a little over a half hour and I'll pay you $5.00 for your time.

ED 056 069

Former NYC Enrollee Questionnaire
(Post-NYC Groups)

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, N. J.

Phone calls	_____ Number
Home visits	_____ Number
Other contacts attempted	_____ Number

☐ M ☐ F

☐ W ☐ Sp.

(1) Name _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

(2) NYC Project _____

(3) Time since left NYC _____ (mos.)

(4) Date of birth _____

(5) Place of birth _____
(City) (State)

(6) Highest school grade completed (when entered NYC) _____

(7) Marital status

☐ Single ☐ Married

☐ Divorced or separated ☐ Widowed

(8) Living with: [single response or appropriate combination]

☐ Mother ☐ Wife or Husband ☐ Stepmother

☐ Father ☐ Brother(s) or Sister(s) ☐ Stepfather

☐ Guardian ☐ Relatives and/or Friends

☐ Children ☐ Live alone

(9) Address [where presently living]

_____
(Street) (City) (State)

(10) How many other places have you lived since you left NYC _____
(number)

(a) How many of these moves within this city _____

(b) How many moves outside -- to other cities _____

ED 056 069

TM 000 067

(11) How have you made out since you left NYC. . . . .

☐ Are you working now [20 hrs. a week or more]

☐ Not working now, but have held job since you left NYC [20 hrs. a week or more, for at least one week]

☐ Not working; have not held job [Go to section II, Page 9]

(12) Where do (did) you work _____

[Company name and address--present or most recent job]

(13) What kind of business is that _____

(14) What kind of work do (did) you do _____

Title [description where needed]

(15) How many hours a week do (did) you work _____

(16) How long on that job _____

[Weeks or months]

(17) Was this the first job since you got out of NYC ☐ Yes ☐ No

[If not first job]

(17a) How many jobs held since leaving NYC _____

(17b) How long were you on each job 1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____

(17c) Job titles for each

1st _____ 2nd_____ 3rd _____

(17d) Why left each job

1st _____ 2nd_____ 3rd _____

(18) How long were you out of NYC before you got the first job _____

[days or weeks]

(19) Which of these did you try to get help from--to get your first job

- ☐ NYC project personnel
- ☐ State employment (YOC)
- ☐ Told about by friends or people in the neighborhood
- ☐ Told about by family
- ☐ Saw it in newspaper (Want ad)
- ☐ Saw sign in window
- ☐ Employment agency where you pay
- ☐ Church and community leaders (Like store owners, school teachers or ministers)
- ☐ Just went to companies and asked about jobs
- ☐ Other _____

(19a) Which one of those was the way you actually got the first job

_____

(20) How many places did you actually get to see someone to ask about a job before you got the first job

_____

(21) In how many places did you actually get to fill out an application before you got the first job

_____

(22) How close have you come to doing what you thought you would when you left NYC--as far as your job goes

- ☐ Much better than you thought you would do
- ☐ About what you expected you would do
- ☐ Worse than you expected to do

(23) About how much do (did) you make on your job per hour when you started /for present job or last job held/

- ☐ $1.25 to $1.50/hr.
- ☐ $1.50 to $1.75/hr.
- ☐ $1.75 to $2.00/hr.
- ☐ $2.00 to $2.50/hr.
- ☐ More than $2.50/hr.

(24) Did you get a raise in pay on your present (or last) job

☐ No ☐ Yes Number of raises _____

Amount - 1st raise _____

2nd raise _____

(25) Did you get a promotion on that job ☐ No ☐ Yes

---

(26) What are your feelings about the kind of work you do (did)

☐ It's great: like it a lot ☐ It's okay ☐ Don't like the work at all

(27) How's your pay for the kind of work you do (did)

☐ Good pay for the kind of job you have (had) ☐ Just about what it should be for the job ☐ A lot less than the job is (was) worth

(28) If you have your way would you want to work for this place five years from now

☐ Definitely no ☐ Not sure: depends on how things go ☐ Yes you would

(29) Do (did) you feel like you're really part of the company (like you really belong)

☐ That's just the way you feel (felt) ☐ Maybe sometimes you feel (felt) that way ☐ No--just another job

(30) How close does (did) your work come to the way you think a job should be

☐ Nowhere near what you think a job should be ☐ Sometimes close to what a job should be ☐ It's just the way you think working on a job should be

(31) How good is (was) your pay if you compare it with what you could get at other companies for the same kind of work

☐ Better pay than other companies for the kind of work ☐ About the same pay as other companies ☐ Less than other places pay for that kind of work

(32) When you took a job in the company--if you knew then what you know now about it--would you have gone to work there

☐ No--not if you knew about the place what you know now

☐ Not too sure

☐ Yes, you would take a job there again

(33) Based on your age, your ability and your experience, how do (did) you feel about your pay

☐ More pay than a guy (girl) like you would expect to make

☐ About where you should be in salary

☐ Making less than a guy (girl) with your experience should expect to make

(34) When you finish a day's work, do (did) you feel like you did something worthwhile

☐ Almost never feel (felt) that way

☐ Sometimes true

☐ Almost always feel (felt) that way

/For those presently employed/

(35) How high do you think you'll be able to go in pay on the job you have now

_____ /hr.
Amount

/Presently employed/

(36) What plans do you have for about the next six months or so /anyone or combination/

☐ Keep working on my job (No particular plans)

☐ Look for a better job

☐ Try to get some extra training (on the job or part-time school)

☐ Go to school full time

(37) What kind of job would you look for if you have to leave this one

☐ Don't know

/Try for job choice/

_____
(Type of job)

/Presently unemployed/

(36a) What plans do you have for about the next six months or so

☐ No particular plans

☐ Try to find another job full-time

☐ Go to school full-time

☐ Find a job and go to school

(37a) What kind of job are you looking for, mainly /or what would you look for when you do look/

☐ Don't know

/Try for job choice/

_____
(Type of job)

(38) What's the most important reason that you picked that job _____

/Single response/

(39) How much do you know about what it takes to do that job /As given in 37 or 37(a)/

☐ A lot about that kind of work

☐ Know a few things about what that job takes

☐ Don't really know much about it

(40) What would you do to get that next job /Prompt only by asking "Anything else"? List as many items as given/

_____ _____

_____ _____

(41) What kind of work do you plan to be doing over a longer time--like five to ten years from now

☐ Don't know (don't plan that far ahead)

☐ Same kind of work you're doing now (or did in previous job)

☐ Choice of occupation

_____

(Single choice)

/If choice given/

(41a) How will you get to do that /No prompts: List responses as given/

☐ Don't know

_____ _____

_____ _____

(42) Are you going to school now

☐ No

☐ Full-time (20 hrs. or more a week)

☐ Part-time (less than 20 hrs. a week)

/If in school/

(42a) What kind of course are you taking _____

(Name of course or type of training program)

(43) How have you been getting along with your family since leaving NYC. (Parents, guardian(s), spouse.)

☐ No family .... /Go to item #46/

☐ Bad--just don't get along with your family at all

☐ Fair. You get by with them

☐ Get along great with your family--no problems

(44) How does your family feel about how you're doing

☐ They think you're doing great

☐ They think you're getting by okay

☐ They don't think you're doing anything worth much

(45) About how much of every ten dollars you make do you put toward the family income /or how much when you did work/

_____
(Amount)

(46) On this list that I show you let me know which of these people or places have been giving you a hard time lately

_____ Supervisor at work

_____ People you work with

_____ Social worker (Welfare)

_____ State employment

_____ School (like teachers or other people that run the school)

_____ The police or the courts

_____ Lawyers

_____ Credit collection outfits

_____ Storekeepers

_____ Somebody in your family

_____ A hospital, or people that work in a hospital clinic (like the doctors; the clerks)

_____ Neighbors or other people you know in your neighborhood

Any others _____

(47) Do you have any ills or problems with your health that bother you

☐ No ☐ Yes

(48) About how many times did you go to see a doctor--because you were sick--since you've been out of NYC

_____
Number

(49) Have you saved any money since you left NYC

☐ All the time (out of just about every paycheck)

☐ Some--off and on

☐ Just about nothing saved

(50) Have you gotten in any trouble with the police since leaving NYC

☐ No /Go to item #53/

☐ Just once

☐ A couple of times

☐ More than a couple of times

(51) Any convictions since you left NYC

☐ None ☐ One conviction ☐ A couple of convictions ☐ More than a couple

(52) Have you been on probation since leaving NYC

☐ No ☐ Yes

(53) How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the cops and the law

☐ Real important: you go out of your way to avoid trouble ☐ You usually try to steer clear unless you're pushed hard ☐ Not too important. If you get in trouble with the cops, it doesn't matter much

(54) Do you buy things on credit

☐ No. Don't use it ☐ Some things. Like expensive ones. ☐ Most everything

(55) Any trouble getting credit for buying what you want

☐ Can get it almost anytime for anything ☐ You can get credit for a few things if you need it ☐ You have a tough time getting credit for almost anything

(56) Did you visit the State Employment Service since you got out of NYC?

☐ No ☐ Yes..... _____ (Number of visits)

(57) Did you receive any unemployment payments during the year?

☐ No ☐ Yes..... _____ (Number of weeks)

(58) Can we send these questions to the place where you work to ask how you're doing there? /Show Employer Rating Scale: STRESS CONFIDENTIALITY/

☐ No ☐ Yes

/If yes/ Supervisor's Name _____

Additional Comments by Former Enrollee

/Section II/

/Not Working; Have Not Held Job/

Are You:

- ☐ Mostly in school /20 hrs. a week or more/
- ☐ In another work-training program (like MDTA, Job Corps, JOBS)
- ☐ Still job hunting
- ☐ Not working--not looking

} ..../Go to Item 15(a)/

- ☐ Housewife
- ☐ Going into military
- ☐ Other _____

(12) What school (or work-training program) are you in _____
(Name **or** type of school or of work-training program)

(13) How long after NYC did you get into that _____
(Time after NYC in Weeks)

(14) What major course are you taking? (What job in work-training program)

_____ _____

(15) What short-term plans do you have--like for the next six months or a year from now

- ☐ Stay in school (or training program)
- ☐ Look for a job
- ☐ Not sure

(15a) What short-term plans do you have--like for the next six months or a year from now?

- ☐ Go to school full time
- ☐ Go to school part time
- ☐ Look (or start looking) for a job
- ☐ Not sure (no special plans)

(16) Have you done any part-time work (off and on) since you left NYC ☐ No ☐ Yes

/If Yes/

(16a) What kind of part-time work _____
(Describe type of Job)

(16b) How much do (did) you get an hour for that _____/hr.

(17) When you look for your first full-time job what kind of job would you look for (Even if remaining in school or if going into military)

☐ Don't know

/Obtain some choice, if possible/ _____
(Type of job)

(18) What's the most important reason that you pick that _____
(Reason)

(19) How much do you know about what it takes to do the job of a _____
(As given in #17)

☐ Know a lot about that kind of work ☐ Know a few things about what job takes ☐ Don't really know much about it

(20) Do you think you would be able to do that work right now

☐ Yes ☐ Not sure ☐ No

/If Yes/

(20a) Why do you think you are able to do that job (What reasons)

_____ _____

_____ _____

(21) What salary do you think you would make when you start the job as a _____
(As given in #17)

_____/hr.

(22) How high do you think you could go in that job in pay? _____/hr.

(23) What are the ways you would look for that job? /List/

☐ Don't know _____ _____

_____ _____

(24) When you go to apply for the job of _____ what would be the
(As given in #17)
most important thing you would ask the interviewer about it

☐ Don't know

_____
/Most Important/

---

(25) How important to you are these other things to ask about when you go for a job interview

(25a) The pay when you start

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25b) How high you could go if you stay in that job (possibilities for being promoted)

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25c) How people get along with each other at that company

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25d) If the job is steady

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25e) How much overtime you have to work

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25f) Whether you get time off to go to school

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking ☐ You might ask in some places ☐ You would always ask

(25g) How much vacation and other benefits the company gives--like life insurance and hospitalization insurance

☐ Not that important. You wouldn't necessarily bother asking

☐ You might ask in some places

☐ You would always ask

==========

(26) What kind of work do you plan to be doing over a longer time--like 5 to 10 years from now

☐ Don't know (don't plan that far ahead)

/Try for choice of occupation/

_____
(Choice of occupation)

(27) How will you get to do that /No prompts: List reponses as given/

☐ Don't know

_____ _____

_____ _____

(28) How have you been getting along with your family since leaving NYC (that is, either parents, guardian(s), spouse)

☐ No family--on my own..... /Go to item 30/

☐ Bad--just don't get along with my family at all

☐ Fair--I get by with them

☐ Get along great with my family--no problems

(29) When you get a job, about how much out of <u>every ten dollars</u> you make would you be willing to put toward the family income _____

(30) On this list that I show you let me know which of these people or places have been giving you a hard time lately

_____ Supervisor at work
_____ People you work with
_____ Social worker (Welfare)
_____ State employment
_____ School (like teachers or people that run the school)
_____ The police or the courts
_____ Lawyers
_____ Credit collection outfits
_____ Storekeepers
_____ Somebody in your family
_____ A hospital, or people that work in a hospital clinic (like the doctors, the clerks)
_____ Neighbors or other people you know in your neighborhood

Any others_____

(31) Do you have any ills or problems with your health that bother you

☐ No ☐ Yes

(32) About how many times did you go to see a doctor-because you were sick-since you've been out of NYC _____?
(Number)

(33) Have you gotten in any trouble with the police since leaving NYC (arrested and charged or booked)

☐ No ☐ Just once ☐ A couple of times ☐ More than a couple of times

[Go to item #36]

(34) Any convictions

☐ None ☐ One conviction ☐ A couple of convictions ☐ More than a couple

(35) Have you been placed on probation since leaving NYC

☐ Yes ☐ No

(36) How important is it to you to keep out of trouble with the cops and the law

☐ Real important: you go out of your way to avoid trouble ☐ Usually try to steer clear unless you're pushed hard ☐ Not too important. If you get in trouble with the cops, it doesn't matter much

(37) Do you buy things on credit

☐ No. Don't use it. ☐ Some things-like expensive ones ☐ Most everything

(38) Any trouble getting credit for buying what you want

☐ Can get it almost anytime for anything ☐ Can get credit for a few things if you need it ☐ Have a tough time getting credit for almost anything

(39) Did you visit the State Employment Service since you got out of NYC

☐ No ☐ Yes ..... _____
(Number of visits)

Additional comments by former enrollee

Appendix D

Guidelines Used for Ratings
of Job Quality

Appendix D

Guidelines Used for Ratings
of Job Quality

The Job Quality scale is intended to define job choices on the basis of a combination of job status, skill levels and potential for advancement. The jobs categorized below are examples of occupations that represent each of the three skill levels at which the given job is to be rated.

Level "1" = Unskilled Jobs: Generally dead end and/or low-level employment, requiring little skill; generally low paid.

Dishwasher
Porter
Nurse's Aide
Hospital Attendant
Laborer
Car Washer
Baggage Handler
Service Station Attendant

Level "2" Semiskilled: Requiring some degree of verbal or other technical skills; moderate pay (or moderate status if low skill).

White Collar Clerical
Truck Driver
Computer Keypunch
Sales Person - (store sales, door-to-door)
Lumberjack
Shipping Clerk
Typist
Waiter
Practical Nurse (LPN)

Level "3" Skilled Trades; Semiprofessional, Professional

Secretary-Stenographer
Nurse (RN)
Baker, Carpenter, Mason
Plumber, Electrician
Auto Mechanic, Machinist
High-Level Sales (e.g., insurance, scientific, or medical equipment)
Computer Operator or Programmer
Lab and Medical Technician

Appendix E

Counselor's and Work Supervisor's
Rating Scales

ED 056 070

NYC Project _____

COUNSELOR'S RATING SCALE

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Counselor's Name _____ Name of Enrollee Being Rated _____

How many months do you know this enrollee _____

On this sheet are 11 statements about enrollee behavior that counselors consider important in determining how well an enrollee is coming along. We would appreciate your evaluation of how these apply to this enrollee.

Please read each statement carefully. Then circle one of the numbers 1 to 5 that best indicates how the statement applies to the enrollee.

1	2	3	4	5
This describes the enrollee perfectly	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually true	The enrollee is not like this at all

		Circle one				
1.	Pays attention to good grooming and dresses appropriately.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Is not very open about discussing personal and job problems.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Shows a lot of resentment and hostility.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Is cooperative and willing to listen to advice.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Makes realistic plans about future jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Shows little poise or self-assurance.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Is coherent in expressing himself (herself).	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Is motivated to want to work and expend effort.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Does not show good day-to-day planning so that he (she) can handle the job (let's home life interfere, for example).	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Indicates a willingness to enroll in school or some sort of training on a part-time basis.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Generally shows unhappiness with the work site assignment and wants to change.	1	2	3	4	5

TM 000 868

ED 056 071

WORK SUPERVISOR'S RATING SCALE
Neighborhood Youth Corps
(Male Enrollee Form)

NYC Project _____

Work Supervisor's Name _____ Name of Enrollee You Are Rating _____

How many months has the enrollee worked for you _____

Below are 10 statements about things that work supervisors consider important when it comes to how the enrollee is doing. We would appreciate your telling us how each one applies to this enrollee. The information is strictly private and will not have any effect on the enrollee in any way.

Please read each statement carefully. Then put a check in one of the five boxes to show how that statement fits the enrollee that you're rating.

1. KNOWS HOW TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS PROPERLY.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. RESENTS TAKING ORDERS FROM THOSE WHO SUPERVISE HIM.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. KNOWS HOW TO DRESS RIGHT FOR THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. TAKES SOME PRIDE IN THE WORK AND DOESN'T JUST RUSH THROUGH TO GET IT FINISHED

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ED 056 071
ED 056 086
000

5. HAS TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO EVERY MINUTE OR HE CAN'T KEEP BUSY.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. GETS ALONG WITH OTHERS ON THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. CAN'T GET TO WORK ON TIME.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. SHOWS SOME INITIATIVE IN TAKING ON A PIECE OF WORK.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. DOESN'T MAKE TROUBLE ON THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. ASKS QUESTIONS IF PROBLEMS COME UP--DOESN'T JUST GO AHEAD AND DO THE JOB WRONG.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ED 056 072

WORK SUPERVISOR'S RATING SCALE
Neighborhood Youth Corps
(Female Enrollee Form)

NYC Project _____

Work Supervisor's Name _____ Name of Enrollee You Are Rating _____

How many months has the enrollee worked for you _____

Below are 10 statements about things that work supervisors consider important when it comes to how the enrollee is doing. We would appreciate your telling us how each one applies to this enrollee. The information is strictly private and will not have any effect on the enrollee in any way.

Please read each statement carefully. Then put a check in one of the five boxes to show how that statement fits the enrollee that you're rating.

1. SHOWS SOME INITIATIVE IN TAKING ON A PIECE OF WORK.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. RESENTS TAKING ORDERS FROM THOSE WHO SUPERVISE HER.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. SHOWS INTEREST IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. CAN'T GET TO WORK ON TIME.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

0 870 000 M.T.

5. HAS TO BE TOLD WHAT TO DO EVERY MINUTE OR SHE CAN'T KEEP BUSY.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

---

6. ASKS QUESTIONS IF PROBLEMS COME UP--DOESN"T JUST GO AHEAD AND DO THE JOB WRONG.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

---

7. IS OFTEN ABSENT FROM WORK.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

---

8. SHOWS SOME PRIDE IN THE WORK AND DOESN'T JUST RUSH THROUGH TO GET IT FINISHED

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

---

9. WASTES TIME ON THE JOB.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

---

10. CAN BE LEFT ON HER OWN WITHOUT CLOSE SUPERVISION.

This describes just how the enrollee is	This is true most of the time	Sometimes this is true of the enrollee	This is not usually so	The enrollee is not like this at all
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix F

Employer's Rating Scale

ED 056 073

Appendix F

Employer's Rating Scale

Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey is doing a study of young adults formerly enrolled in a government sponsored work-training program. We would appreciate your giving a brief evaluation of one of your employees (or former employees) who was enrolled in one such program.

The individual we are interested in is _____

We have his (her) permission to ask you for this information. Your responses are completely confidential and will never be identified with you or your organization; nor will they be used to affect this employee in any way.

(1) Do you feel that this employee puts in a decent day's work

☐ Yes, definitely ☐ Generally; not always ☐ Definitely not

(2) Does this employee get along with the other workers on the job

☐ Yes, definitely ☐ Generally; not always ☐ Definitely not

(3) Would you promote this employee

☐ Yes, definitely ☐ Maybe; not certain ☐ Definitely not

(4) Would you hire this employee again

☐ Yes, definitely ☐ Maybe; with a few reservations ☐ Definitely not

CG 008 871

Appendix G

Rotated Factor Loadings (Varimax)
Program Completion and Post-Program Criteria

Rotated Factor Loadings (Varimax)

Program Completion Criterion Variables*

Variable	Factors I Training Program Adjustment	II Social Community Adjustment	III Job Aspiration Level	IV Self-Confident Image	V Planning Competency
1. Vocational Adequacy (Total Scale)	-08	13	38	40	-16
2. Quality of First Job Desired	-16	00	58	-07	11
3. Reason for Selecting Job (Irrel/Rel)	-13	22	05	15	25
4. Awareness of Job Characteristics	-10	-12	-05	47	04
5. Knowledge of Job Selected	14	01	21	-05	72
6. Ability to Do Job	-12	07	-08	20	72
7. Starting Salary Expected	22	05	69	-01	-06
8. Highest Salary Expected	27	28	73	-02	-15
9. Ways to Look for Job (# Rel. Responses)	-30**	13	-20	02	44
10. Important Things to Ask Job Interviewer	-17	-28	05	19	13
11. Job Search Plans (Suitability)	09	-07	07	-32	35
12. Long Range Plans (Quality)	-07	-05	56	-04	26
13. Ability to Accomplish Plans (Relevance)	00	-47	47	-00	07
14. Get Along with Family	06	-60	-03	08	09
15. Family Feelings About Enrollee	12	-07	-11	13	12
16. Financial Assistance to Family	-08	04	-03	06	05
17. Save Money	-31	14	-11	-25	-04
18. Number of People Giving Hard Time	06	71	06	-01	25
19. Health Problems (No/Yes)	15	14	25	-38	-05
20. Amount of Trouble with the Police	66	47	05	20	01
21. Importance of Keeping Out of Trouble	-10	-07	05	18	13
22. Number of Jobs Chosen for Training	-49	-02	-18	-05	07
23. Willingness to Take Training Full Time	22	-05	-18	01	-05
24. Willingness to Train Part Time	28	-24	-06	-00	25
25. Job Motivation Scale (Total Score)	29	-17	30	15	-09
26. Counselor Rating Scale	-57	09	01	41	-15
27. Work Supervisor Scale	-64	10	04	17	14
28. Actual Police Contacts	54	56	19	06	09
29. Number Work Site Assignments	04	05	-13	-09	-05
30. Number Work Site Absences	61	20	-10	-17	12
31. Peer Rating Score	00	-41	-27	49	04
32. Number of Times Chosen for Peer Rating	13	21	18	60	07

*Decimal points omitted.

**Loadings used in factor interpretation are underlined.

Rotated Factor Loadings (Varimax)

Post-Program Criterion Variables

(Employment Experience)

Variable	Factors I General Job Success & Adjustment	II Striving for Vocational Success	III Job Stability-Mobility	IV Blue Collar Job Success	V Community & Family Adjustment	VI Vocational Adjustment-Dissatisfaction
1. # of Interviewer Contacts Required	09	-52	28	13	13	-14
2. # of Places Lived Since Left NYC	-07	20	46	06	25	-16
3. Employed Now (No/Yes)	80	00	-00	-05	00	09
4. Industrial Category (Wh Collar/Bl Collar)	-36	-06	18	41	09	-00
5. Job Quality (Present or Last Job)	11	38	-05	40	02	08
6. Hours Worked/Week	-02	-02	-00	54	-04	-10
7. Length on Present (or Last) Job	52	14	-22	35	05	-20
8. Number of Jobs Held Since NYC	-19	03	57	13	01	-12
9. Reason Left Job (Poor/Good)	12	-12	02	-03	04	68
10. Time to Find First Job	-02	-01	23	-56	-10	-09
11. Number of Sources Used for First Job	09	-20	25	10	-34	21
12. Number of Places Interviewed	04	-06	80	-07	-22	11
13. Number of Applications Filed	04	-11	82	-09	-11	17
14. Met Job Expectations	48	01	-09	14	24	-35
15. Starting Salary	28	14	20	47	02	-29
16. Number of Salary Raises	22	15	25	41	-05	32
17. Amount of First Raise	04	55	-07	14	08	-11
18. Promotion (No/Yes)	30	61	16	21	16	00
19. Job Satisfaction Scale (Total Score)	30	-04	-15	38	13	-30
20. Level of Short-Term Plans	-02	27	-11	-13	10	42
21. Job Level Sought (Short Term)	-14	46	12	-07	32	42
22. Level of Long-Term Plans	-08	13	-03	-42	26	22
23. Getting Along with Family	09	-17	-02	35	32	39
24. Family Feelings About Enrollee	68	-05	-03	14	23	-01
25. Financial Assistance to Family	01	06	04	10	61	04
26. Number of People Giving Hard Time	-03	58	23	-27	-34	-14
27. Health Problems (No/Yes)	03	02	03	-04	25	-16
28. Number Times Visited Doctor	-01	24	01	03	45	-36
29. Save Money	57	05	02	08	02	33
30. Amount of Trouble with Police	-32	26	22	04	-60	-22
31. Credit Buying (No/Yes)	01	03	07	-08	-01	-00
32. Ease of Obtaining Credit	26	13	26	05	48	20
33. Number of Visits to USES	-35	-01	49	-12	09	06
34. Permission for Employer Rating (No/Yes)	30	40	18	-20	07	-16
35. Employer Rating	59	34	-40	-07	-06	37
36. Police Contacts (No/Yes)	-45	16	24	21	-59	-11

Rotated Factor Loadings (Varimax)

Post-Program Criterion Variables

(No Employment Experience)

Variable	Factors I Community Adjustment	II Striving for Personal Improvement	III Realistic Aspirations	IV Job Motivation & Planning
1. # of Interviewer Contacts Required	13	39	-32	-29
2. # of Places Lived Since Left NYC	05	09	66	-13
3. Level of Current Activity	01	31	03	65
4. Level of Short-Term Plans	-03	-07	10	67
5. Part Time Work (No/Yes)	-05	81	00	05
6. Job Quality Level Sought	28	-04	-11	53
7. Reason Picked Job Sought (Irrel/Rel)	-04	-02	-10	22
8. Knowledge of Job Sought	-05	-24	64	13
9. Ability to Reform Job Sought	-11	-02	77	-06
10. Reason for Ability (Irrel/Rel)	-05	01	-16	48
11. Starting Salary Expected	-29	59	-32	16
12. Highest Salary Expected	-36	14	-59	06
13. Ways to Look for Job (Relevance)	22	01	-06	-15
14. Things to Ask About Job	-14	-16	-02	02
15. Concern for Job Characteristics	25	-01	-07	76
16. Long Range Work Plans (Quality)	05	-09	-14	17
17. Means to Achieve Plans	07	04	-23	-13
18. Get Along with Family	12	30	43	31
19. Future Financial Contribution to Family	46	13	55	-18
20. # of People Giving Hard Time	-17	-30	-21	04
21. Health Problems (No/Yes)	09	-10	26	15
22. # of Times Visited a Doctor	35	-04	23	12
23. Amount of Trouble with Police	-84	04	-02	-12
24. Credit Buying (No/Yes)	21	05	-02	10
25. Ease of Obtaining Credit	52	25	41	19
26. Visits to State Employment Service	15	01	-05	06
27. Actual Police Contacts	-85	18	03	-11